arXiv:1611.00352v2 [quant-ph] 21 Jan 2017

Device-independent randomness generation from several Bell estimators

Olmo Nieto-Silleras, Cédric Bamps, Jonathan Silman, Stefano Pironio

Laboratoire d'Information Quantique, CP224
Université libre de Bruxelles, 1050 Brussels (Belgium)

(Dated: January 24, 2017)

Abstract

Device-independent randomness generation and quantum key distribution protocols rely on a fundamental relation between the non-locality of quantum theory and its random character. This relation is usually expressed in terms of a trade-off between the probability of guessing correctly the outcomes of measurements performed on quantum systems and the amount of violation of a given Bell inequality. However, a more accurate assessment of the randomness produced in Bell experiments can be obtained if the value of several Bell expressions is simultaneously taken into account, or if the full set of probabilities characterizing the behavior of the device is considered. We introduce protocols for device-independent randomness generation, secure against classical side information, that rely on the estimation of an arbitrary number of Bell expressions or even directly on the experimental frequencies of measurement outcomes. Asymptotically, this results in an optimal generation of randomness from experimental data (as measured by the min-entropy), without having to assume beforehand that the devices violate a specific Bell inequality.

1 Introduction

In recent years, researchers have uncovered a fundamental relationship between the non-locality of quantum theory and its random character. This relationship is usually formulated as follows. Consider two (or generally k) separated quantum devices accepting, respectively, classical inputs x_1 and x_2 and outputting classical outputs a_1 and a_2. Let $p = \{p(\mathrm{a}_1\mathrm{a}_2|\mathrm{x}_1\mathrm{x}_2)\}$ denote the set of joint probabilities describing how the devices respond to given inputs, from the point of view of a user who can only interact with the devices through the input-output interface, but who has no knowledge of the inner workings of the devices. Suppose that given p, the expectation value of a certain Bell expression f, such as the Clauser-Horne-Shimony-Holt (CHSH) expression [1], equals $f[p]$. Then, it is in principle possible to compute a lower bound on the randomness generated by the devices, as quantified by the negative logarithm of the guessing probability—the maximal probability of correctly guessing the values of future outputs. This bound on the guessing probability holds for any observer, including those having an arbitrarily precise description of the inner workings of the devices, and depends only on information derived from the resulting input-output behavior through the quantity $f[p]$. In principle, this bound can be computed numerically for any given Bell expression f. For certain Bell expressions, such as the CHSH expression, it can also be determined analytically.

This relation between the non-locality of quantum theory and its randomness is at the basis of various protocols for device-independent (DI) randomness generation (RNG) [2, 3] and quantum key distribution (QKD) [4, 5]. The theoretical analysis of such protocols presents us with an extra challenge in that the probabilistic behavior p of the devices is not known in advance and may vary from one measurement run to the next. This implies that bounds on the guessing probability as a function of $f[p]$ have to be adapted to rely instead on the estimated value of the Bell expression f from experimental data. Some DIRNG and DIQKD protocols, and their security analyses, are reliant on specific Bell inequalities (usually the CHSH inequality) [6–9] or certain families of Bell inequalities [10–12], while others may be adapted to

arbitrary Bell inequalities [3, 13–17]. However, to our knowledge all DIRNG and DIQKD protocols in the literature require that a single Bell inequality be chosen in advance and its experimental violation estimated (one exception is [18], where two fixed Bell expressions are used). The length and secrecy of the final key will then depend on the observed violation of the chosen inequality.

Nevertheless, it has been pointed out in [19, 20] that the fundamental relation between the randomness and non-locality of quantum theory does not necessarily need to be expressed in terms of a specific Bell inequality. It is in principle possible, at least numerically, to bound the probability of guessing correctly the outputs of a pair of quantum devices directly from the knowledge of the joint input-output probabilities p. Indeed, the amount of violation $f[p]$ of a given Bell inequality captures the non-local behavior of the devices only partially, and better bounds on the guessing probability can be obtained if all the information about the devices' behavior is taken into account.

This observation raises the following question: can one devise a device-independent RNG or QKD protocol that does not rely on the estimation of any a priori chosen Bell inequality, but which instead takes directly into account all the data generated by the devices?

There are various reasons for introducing protocols of this type. First, as already mentioned, the entire set of data generated by the devices can provide more information than the violation of a specific Bell inequality, and may therefore potentially allow for more efficient protocols. Second, the choice of a Bell inequality may have a deep influence on the amount of randomness that can be certified: as shown in [21] there are devices for which the amount of randomness, as computed from the CHSH inequality, is arbitrarily small, but is maximal if computed using another Bell inequality. Third, even if a set of quantum devices have been specifically designed to maximize the randomness according to a specific Bell inequality, the optimal extraction of randomness from noisy versions of such devices, say because of degradation of the devices with time, will typically rely on other Bell inequalities [19, 20]. Finally, suppose that one is given a set of quantum devices without any specification of which Bell inequality they are expected to violate. Can one nevertheless directly use them in a protocol and obtain a non-zero random string or shared key, without testing their behavior beforehand?

We show here that it is indeed possible to devise DIRNG protocols which exploit more information than the estimated violation of a single Bell inequality, particularly, DIRNG protocols which exploit the full set of frequencies obtained (i.e., the entire set of estimates of the behavior p). Specifically, we introduce a DIRNG protocol whose security holds against an adversary limited to classical side information, or equivalently, with no long-term quantum memory. (Note that such a level of security may well be sufficient for all practical purposes [14, 15].) Technically, our protocol is obtained by generalizing the security analysis introduced in [14, 15] and combining it with the semidefinite programming techniques introduced in [19, 20] for upper-bounding the guessing probability based on the full set of probabilities p (which cannot be directly applied to experimental data; see the discussion in Section 7.3).

We start in Section 2 by briefly presenting the theoretical framework of our work, its main assumptions, and the notation used throughout the paper. In Sections 3 to 5 we present our main mathematical results. In Section 3 we present the main theorem of the paper and explain in detail how to put a DI bound on the randomness produced when measuring a Bell device n times in succession, given that we have a way to bound the single-round probabilities characterizing the behavior of the device as a function of the Bell expectation, and given that we can estimate the Bell expectation with some confidence. These two sub-procedures are respectively presented in Sections 4 and 5 for the general case of an arbitrary number of Bell expressions. Combining these two sub-procedures with the general approach of Section 3 immediately yields a DIRNG protocol, whose various steps are summarized in Section 6. In Section 7 we discuss in detail the main features of our protocol, and illustrate these with a numerical example. We end with some concluding remarks and open questions in Section 8.

2 Behaviors and Bell expressions

In the following we will refer to a Bell set up, that is to say, k separated "black" boxes (quantum devices whose inner workings are unknown), as a Bell device. Each box i can receive an input x_i upon which it produces an output a_i, with x_i and a_i taking values in some finite sets $\mathcal{X}_i$ and $\mathcal{A}_i$, respectively, where without loss of generality we assume that the set of outputs $\mathcal{A}_i$ does not depend on the input x_i. We write $x = (\mathrm{x}_1, \ldots, \mathrm{x}_k)$ and $a = (\mathrm{a}_1, \ldots, \mathrm{a}_k)$ for the k-tuple of inputs and outputs, and write $\mathcal{X} = \mathcal{X}_1 \times \cdots \times \mathcal{X}_k$ and $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}_1 \times \cdots \times \mathcal{A}_k$ for the set of all possible k-tuples of inputs and outputs. Note that we use a

roman (upright) type for the inputs and outputs of a single box and an italic type for the joint inputs and outputs of all k boxes.

The behavior of a single-round use of this Bell device can be characterized by the $|\mathcal{A}| \times |\mathcal{X}|$ joint probabilities $p(a|x)$, which we can consider as the components of a vector $p \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{A}|\times|\mathcal{X}|}$. We denote by $\mathcal{Q} \subset \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{A}|\times|\mathcal{X}|}$ the set of behaviors p which admit a quantum representation, i.e., the set of behaviors such that there exist a k-partite quantum state and local measurements yielding the outcomes a with probability $p(a|x)$ when performing the measurements x. It is well-known that the set $\mathcal{Q}$ can be approximated from its exterior (from outside the set) by a series of semidefinite programs (SDP) using the NPA hierarchy [22].

We define a *Bell expression* as a vector $f \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{A}|\times|\mathcal{X}|}$ with components $f(a,x)$. The Bell expression f defines a linear form on the set of behaviors p through

$$f[p] = \sum_{a,x} f(a,x)p(a|x)\,. \tag{1}$$

We refer to $f[p]$ as the expectation of f with respect to the behavior p.

We consider here a framework in which the information we have about the Bell device is not necessarily given by the full behavior p, but possibly only by the expectation of one or more Bell expressions. In the following, we thus assume that t Bell expressions f_α ($\alpha = 1,\ldots,t$) have been selected. (The certifiable randomness will depend on this initial choice of Bell expressions. This issue is discussed later.) We denote by $\mathbf{f} = (f_1,\ldots,f_t)$ these t Bell expressions and by $\mathbf{f}[p] = (f_1[p],\ldots,f_t[p])$ their expectations with respect to the behavior p. As an example, in a bipartite scenario, we might only know the value of the CHSH expression, in which case $t = 1$ and there is a single f defined by $f(a,x) = (-1)^{\mathrm{a}_1+\mathrm{a}_2+\mathrm{x}_1\mathrm{x}_2}$. But the framework is also applicable when $\mathbf{f}[p]$ corresponds to the full set p of probabilities. One simply needs to consider $|\mathcal{A}| \times |\mathcal{X}|$ f_αs (for each pairing (a,x)), which are defined by $f_{a,x}(a',x') = \delta_{(a,x),(a',x')}$, so that $f_{a,x}[p] = p(a|x)$.

Of course, in a DI protocol, we are not actually given $\mathbf{f}[p]$, but must estimate it by performing sequential measurements. We are thus led to consider a Bell device which is used n times in succession. We write $\vec{x} = (x_1,\ldots,x_n)$ and $\vec{a} = (a_1,\ldots,a_n)$ for the corresponding sequence of inputs and outputs and $\vec{x}_j = (x_1,\ldots,x_j)$ and $\vec{a}_j = (a_1,\ldots,a_j)$ for the sequences of inputs and outputs up to, and including, round j.

We write $P(\vec{a}|\vec{x})$ for the conditional probabilities of obtaining the sequence of outputs $\vec{a}$ given a certain sequence of inputs $\vec{x}$. Note that we use an upper-case P to denote the n-round behavior of the boxes and lower-case p's for single-round behaviors. We assume that the Bell device is "probed" using inputs $\vec{x}$ distributed according to a probability distribution $\Pi(\vec{x})$. We will consider, in particular, the case where at each round the inputs are selected according to identical and independent distributions $\pi(x)$, so that $\Pi(\vec{x}) = \prod_{j=1}^n \pi(x_j)$ (though this condition can actually be slightly relaxed in the results that follow). The full (non-conditional) n-round probabilities are thus given by $P(\vec{a},\vec{x}) = P(\vec{a}|\vec{x})\,\Pi(\vec{x})$. We denote by P_{AX} and $P_{A|X}$ the distributions corresponding to the probabilities $P(\vec{a},\vec{x})$ and $P(\vec{a}|\vec{x})$, respectively.

The only assumption we make about the Bell device is that at each round it is characterized by a joint entangled quantum state and a respective set of local measurement operators for each box. Each set of local measurement operators can depend on the past inputs and outputs of all k boxes (separated boxes can thus freely communicate between measurement rounds), but does not depend on future inputs (inputs are thus selected independently of the state of the device) or inputs of the $k-1$ other boxes in the same round. Mathematically, this means that we can write $P(\vec{a}|\vec{x}) = \prod_{j=1}^n P(a_j|x_j,\vec{a}_{j-1},\vec{x}_{j-1})$ and that the (single-round) behavior $p_{\vec{a}_{j-1},\vec{x}_{j-1}}$ at round j, given the past inputs and outputs $\vec{x}_{j-1}$ and $\vec{a}_{j-1}$, which is defined by the probabilities $p_{\vec{a}_{j-1},\vec{x}_{j-1}}(a_j|x_j) = P(a_j|x_j,\vec{a}_{j-1},\vec{x}_{j-1})$, should be a valid no-signaling quantum behavior, i.e., $p_{\vec{a}_{j-1},\vec{x}_{j-1}} \in \mathcal{Q}$.

We assume that the internal behavior of the boxes may be classically correlated with a system in the possession of an adversary. Formally, these correlations and the adversary's knowledge can be represented through the joint probabilities $P(\vec{a},\vec{x},e)$, where e denotes the adversary's classical side information. However, in order to keep the notation simple, we do not explicitly include e in the following. All the reasonings that follow would nevertheless hold, with only minor modifications, if the adversary's classical side information e were explicitly taken into account. This can be understood by comparing our proofs with those in [14]. Alternatively, e can be formally viewed as an initial input $x_0 = e$.

In the following, we sometimes adopt a terminology where the k-tuples x and a are referred to as the input and output of (a single round use of) the Bell device (though of course each consists of the inputs and outputs, respectively, of all k boxes).

3 A general procedure for DIRNG against classical side-information

In this section, we show how to quantify the randomness produced by n sequential uses of the Bell device based on the Bell expressions $\mathbf{f}$. We follow the approach introduced in [3, 14]. This approach relies on two essential sub-procedures: a first sub-procedure to bound the randomness of single-round behaviors and a second sub-procedure to estimate a certain quantity involving the Bell expressions $\mathbf{f}$. Given these two ingredients, the single-round randomness bound can, through some simple algebra, be adapted to the n-round scenario and related to the actual data obtained in the Bell experiment.

We provide a macro-level description of this approach, which relies only on certain general mathematical properties that these two basic sub-procedures must satisfy, but not on any specifics as to how to implement them. We will present explicit ways to carry out these sub-procedures in the next two sections.

Intuitively, the output of the Bell device is random if the probabilities $P(\vec{a}|\vec{x})$ are all upper-bounded by a number strictly smaller than 1 for some choice of inputs $\vec{x}$. Our first aim will thus be to upper-bound these probabilities without making any assumptions regarding the Bell device's behavior apart from the ones stated in Section 2. We will then see how to turn this bound into a more formal statement in terms of min-entropy.

To bound the n-round probabilities $P(\vec{a}|\vec{x})$, we assume the existence of a function G, which bounds single-round probabilities $p(a|x)$ as a function of the Bell expectations $\mathbf{f}[p]$. This is our first ingredient. We actually require this function to non-trivially bound only the probabilities $p(a|x)$ corresponding to a certain subset $\mathcal{X}_r \subseteq \mathcal{X}$ of all possible inputs. This is due to the fact that for certain behaviors, some inputs x lead to less predictable outputs than those resulting from other inputs, and we therefore have an interest to focus on these inputs only. (As will be elaborated on later, the amount of certifiable randomness generally depends on the choice of $\mathcal{X}_r$.) Formally, the function G, on which our results are based, is defined as follows.

Definition 1. *A function $G : \mathbf{f}[\mathcal{Q}] \to \left[\frac{1}{|\mathcal{A}|}, 1\right]$ is a randomness-bounding (RB) function if it satisfies the following properties:*

1. *$p(a|x) \leq G(\mathbf{f}[p])$ for all $a \in \mathcal{A}$, all $x \in \mathcal{X}_r$, and all $p \in \mathcal{Q}$.*
2. *$G(\mathbf{f}[p])$ is a concave function of its argument:*

$$G(q\,\mathbf{f}[p_1] + (1-q)\,\mathbf{f}[p_2]) \geq q\,G(\mathbf{f}[p_1]) + (1-q)\,G(\mathbf{f}[p_2]) \tag{2}$$

for any $0 \leq q \leq 1$ and any $p_1, p_2 \in \mathcal{Q}$.

We will also need to compute an upper bound on $G(\mathbf{f}[p])$ for all behaviors $p \in \mathcal{Q}$ such that $\mathbf{f}[p] \in \mathcal{V}$ for some arbitrary region $\mathcal{V} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^t$. We will say that $G(\mathcal{V})$ bounds the randomness in $\mathcal{V}$ if

$$G(\mathcal{V}) \geq \sup\{G(\mathbf{f}[p]) \,:\, \mathbf{f}[p] \in \mathbf{f}[\mathcal{Q}] \cap \mathcal{V}\}\,. \tag{3}$$

When $\mathbf{f}[\mathcal{Q}] \cap \mathcal{V} = \emptyset$, we define $G(\mathcal{V}) = 1$. Furthermore, we define $\tau = 1/\min_{p\in\mathcal{Q}} G(\mathbf{f}[p])$ (note that $\tau \leq |\mathcal{A}|$). We discuss the intuitive interpretation of G and its properties in Section 5.

Given a RB function G, we can now easily upper-bound the n-round probabilities:

Lemma 1. *Let G be a RB function. Then, for any $(\vec{a}, \vec{x})$ and any Bell device behavior $P_{A|X}$*

$$P(\vec{a}|\vec{x}) \leq G^n\left(\frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^{n} \mathbf{f}\left[p_{\vec{a}_{j-1},\vec{x}_{j-1}}\right]\right)\tau^{\gamma(\vec{x})}\,, \tag{4}$$

where

$$\gamma(\vec{x}) = \sum_{j=1}^{n} \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{X}\setminus\mathcal{X}_r}(x_j) \tag{5}$$

is the number of x_j *in* $\vec{x} = (x_1, \ldots, x_n)$ *which do not belong to the set* $\mathcal{X}_r$*.*

Proof of Lemma 1. The proof follows essentially the same steps as the proof of Lemma 1 in [14]. The main differences are (a) that we express the bound eq. (4) as a function of t Bell expressions, instead of a single Bell expression, and (b) that the bound considers explicitly only the randomness from the inputs in $\mathcal{X}_r$.

From our assumptions regarding the Bell device, it follows that for any $(\vec{a}, \vec{x})$ we can write

$$P(\vec{a}|\vec{x}) = \prod_{j=1}^{n} p_{\vec{a}_{j-1},\vec{x}_{j-1}}(a_j|x_j). \tag{6}$$

If $x_j \in \mathcal{X}_r$, then we can bound, according to the definition of the function G, the terms $p_{\vec{a}_{j-1},\vec{x}_{j-1}}(a_j|x_j)$ by $G(\mathbf{f}[p_{\vec{a}_{j-1},\vec{x}_{j-1}}])$. If $x_j \notin \mathcal{X}_r$, it is certainly the case that $p_{\vec{a}_{j-1},\vec{x}_{j-1}}(a_j|x_j) \leq 1 \leq G(\mathbf{f}[p_{\vec{a}_{j-1},\vec{x}_{j-1}}]) \times \tau$. We can thus write

$$P(\vec{a}|\vec{x}) \leq \prod_{j=1}^{n} G(\mathbf{f}[p_{\vec{a}_{j-1},\vec{x}_{j-1}}])\tau^{\gamma(\vec{x})} \tag{7}$$

$$\leq G^n\left(\frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^{n} \mathbf{f}\left[p_{\vec{a}_{j-1},\vec{x}_{j-1}}\right]\right)\tau^{\gamma(\vec{x})}, \tag{8}$$

where in the last line we have exploited the log-concavity of G (since G is concave and positive over its domain, it is also log-concave). □

Lemma 1 tells us how to bound the probabilities $P(\vec{a}|\vec{x})$ as a function of the quantity $\frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^{n} \mathbf{f}[p_{\vec{a}_{j-1},\vec{x}_{j-1}}]$, which can be understood as an n-round average Bell expectation, where the average is taken conditioned on past inputs and outputs at each preceding round. This quantity, however, is not directly observable. This leads us to introduce the following definition of a confidence region, which is the second ingredient needed in our approach.

Definition 2. *A* $1-\epsilon$ *confidence region* $\mathcal{V}(\vec{a}, \vec{x}, \epsilon)$ *for* $\frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^{n} \mathbf{f}[p_{\vec{a}_{j-1},\vec{x}_{j-1}}]$ *is a subset of* $\mathbb{R}^t$ *such that, according to any distribution* P_{AX}*,*

$$\Pr\left[\frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^{n} \mathbf{f}\left[p_{\vec{a}_{j-1},\vec{x}_{j-1}}\right] \in \mathcal{V}(\vec{a}, \vec{x}, \epsilon)\right] \geq 1 - \epsilon\,. \tag{9}$$

We denote by $V = \{(\vec{a}, \vec{x}) : \frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^{n} \mathbf{f}[p_{\vec{a}_{j-1},\vec{x}_{j-1}}] \in \mathcal{V}(\vec{a}, \vec{x}, \epsilon)\}$ *the set of input-output sequences such that* $\frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^{n} \mathbf{f}[p_{\vec{a}_{j-1},\vec{x}_{j-1}}]$ *belongs to the confidence region* $\mathcal{V}$*.*

(Note that in general $\mathcal{V}$ explicitly depends on $\vec{a}$ and $\vec{x}$, although notation-wise this dependence is sometimes left implicit.) In other words, for small ϵ and large n, knowing the outcomes $(\vec{a}, \vec{x})$ of n rounds of measurement, one can determine $\mathcal{V} = \mathcal{V}(\vec{a}, \vec{x}, \epsilon)$ and assert with high confidence that $\frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^{n} \mathbf{f}[p_{\vec{a}_{j-1},\vec{x}_{j-1}}]$ is somewhere in $\mathcal{V}$, even though its exact value cannot be deduced from $(\vec{a}, \vec{x})$ alone. The assertion is false if and only if $(\vec{a}, \vec{x}) \notin V$, which occurs with a probability smaller than ϵ by definition.

Combining eq. (8) with this definition immediately implies the following:

Lemma 2. *Let* $\mathcal{V}$ *be a* $1-\epsilon$ *confidence region according to Definition 2. Then for any* $(\vec{a}, \vec{x}) \in V$

$$P(\vec{a}|\vec{x}) \leq G^n(\mathcal{V})\,\tau^{\gamma(\vec{x})}\,. \tag{10}$$

Lemma 2 tells us that the occurrence probability of $\vec{a}$ given $\vec{x}$ is upper-bounded by a function of $(\vec{a}, \vec{x})$, except for a subset of "bad" events $\{(\vec{a}, \vec{x}) \notin V\}$. One way to deal with these bad events is simply to pretend that the boxes are characterized by a slightly modified behavior $\tilde{P}$ that yields an "abort" output

$\vec{a} = \perp$ when one of the bad events is obtained. Since the probability of these bad events is extremely low for sufficiently small ϵ, analyzing the security using $\tilde{P}$ instead of P yields the same result up to vanishing error terms. (The "true" behavior P and the "ideal" one $\tilde{P}$ are almost indistinguishable. See [14] for a more detailed discussion.)

Lemma 3. *There exists a behavior $\tilde{P}_{A|X}$ such that $\tilde{P}_{AX} = \tilde{P}_{A|X} \times \Pi_X$ and $P_{AX} = P_{A|X} \times \Pi_X$ are ϵ-close and such that for any $\vec{a} \neq \perp$*

$$\tilde{P}(\vec{a}|\vec{x}) \leq G^n(\mathcal{V})\, \tau^{\gamma(\vec{x})}\,. \tag{11}$$

Proof. The proof of this lemma is analogous to that of Lemma 3 in [14]. Define $\tilde{P}_{A|X}$ as

$$\tilde{P}(\vec{a}|\vec{x}) = \begin{cases} P(\vec{a}|\vec{x}) & \text{if } (\vec{a},\vec{x}) \in V, \\ 0 & \text{if } (\vec{a},\vec{x}) \notin V \text{ and } \vec{a} \neq \perp, \\ \sum_{\vec{a}:(\vec{a},\vec{x})\notin V} P(\vec{a}|\vec{x}) & \text{if } \vec{a} = \perp\,. \end{cases} \tag{12}$$

Lemma 2 implies eq. (11), and it is immediate that $d(\tilde{P}_{AX}, P_{AX}) = \frac{1}{2}\sum_{\vec{a},\vec{x}} |\tilde{P}(\vec{a},\vec{x}) - P(\vec{a},\vec{x})| \leq \epsilon$. □

We can now put a bound on the randomness of the Bell device as follows. Let λ denote the event that $-\log_2(G^n(\mathcal{V})\tau^{\gamma(\vec{x})})$ is greater than some a priori fixed threshold H. Conditioned on λ occurring, we can bound the conditional min-entropy of the outputs given the inputs, $H_{\min}(A|X;\lambda) = -\log_2 \sum_{\vec{x}} \tilde{P}(\vec{x}|\lambda) \max_{\vec{a}} \tilde{P}(\vec{a}|\vec{x};\lambda)$, as follows (see [23] for a more detailed discussion of the concept of min-entropy and its relevance in our context):

$$H_{\min}(A|X;\lambda) = -\log_2 \sum_{\vec{x}} \tilde{P}(\vec{x}|\lambda) \max_{\vec{a}} \tilde{P}(\vec{a}|\vec{x};\lambda) \tag{13}$$

$$= -\log_2 \sum_{\vec{x}} \frac{\tilde{P}(\vec{x}|\lambda)}{\tilde{P}(\lambda|\vec{x})} \max_{\vec{a}\in\Lambda_{\vec{x}}} \tilde{P}(\vec{a}|\vec{x}) \tag{14}$$

$$\geq -\log_2 \sum_{\vec{x}} \frac{\tilde{P}(\vec{x})}{\tilde{P}(\lambda)} 2^{-H} \tag{15}$$

$$\geq H - \log_2 \frac{1}{\tilde{P}(\lambda)}\,. \tag{16}$$

In the second line we defined $\Lambda_{\vec{x}}$ as the set of $\vec{a}$'s such that the event λ occurs given $\vec{x}$, and in the third line we used eq. (11) and the fact that $G^n(\mathcal{V})\,\tau^{\gamma(\vec{x})} \leq 2^{-H}$ by the definition of λ. Comparing $\tilde{P}(\lambda)$ to some positive ϵ' directly implies the following result:

Theorem 1. *Let ϵ and ϵ' be two positive parameters, let H be some threshold, and let λ be the event that $-\log_2(G^n(\mathcal{V})\,\tau^{\gamma(\vec{x})}) \geq H$, where $\mathcal{V}$ is a $1-\epsilon$ confidence region according to Definition 2. Then the behavior P_{AX} is ϵ-close to a behavior $\tilde{P}_{AX}$ such that, according to $\tilde{P}_{AX}$,*

1. *either* $\Pr(\lambda) \leq \epsilon'$,
2. *or* $H_{\min}(A|X;\lambda) \geq H - \log_2 \frac{1}{\epsilon'}$. □

The meaning of this result is as follows. Suppose we can compute a RB function, according to Definition 1, and a $1-\epsilon$ confidence region, according to Definition 2. We can thus compute $-\log_2(G^n(\mathcal{V})\,\tau^{\gamma(\vec{x})})$ and verify whether it is above some threshold H. If the probability of this event occurring is higher than some probability ϵ', which we may choose as small as we wish, then the bound $H_{\min}(A|X;\lambda) \geq H - \log_2 \frac{1}{\epsilon'}$ must hold for the conditional min-entropy. It may thus be the case that we observe that $-\log_2(G^n(\mathcal{V})\,\tau^{\gamma(\vec{x})})$ is greater than the threshold H even though the entropy is lower than the value we assigned to it. However, the probability of this happening is negligible, as it is at most ϵ'. We cannot, of course, expect better than a statement of this type. For instance, a Bell device that simply outputs predetermined bits, which have been chosen uniformly at random by an adversary, will have zero conditional min-entropy, but may pass any statistical test we can devise with some positive probability.

Given a bound on the conditional min-entropy $H_{\min}(A|X;\lambda)$, one can then use a randomness extractor to process the raw outputs $\vec{a}$ and obtain a final string of bits, which is close to uniformly random, and whose size is essentially $H_{\min}(A|X;\lambda)$ [24]. The security of the resulting protocol (how close the final

random string is to a uniformly random string about which the adversary has no information) can easily be related to ϵ and ϵ'. (See Section III.D of [14] for details.)

Note that more generally, one can define a similar protocol based on a sequence of thresholds $H_0 < H_1 < \cdots < H_\ell$, rather than a single threshold. Theorem 1 then becomes a set of individual statements, regarding events λ_i where $-\log_2(G^n(\mathcal{V}))\tau^{\gamma(\vec{x})} \in [H_i, H_{i+1}[$ for $i = 0, \ldots, \ell - 1$. This means that the protocol admits intermediate thresholds of success leading to increasingly better min-entropy bounds, rather than being a single-threshold, all-or-nothing protocol. (See Section III.D of [14] for details.)

4 Estimation

In this section we explicitly show how to construct a confidence region, according to Definition 2, using a straightforward estimator for the Bell expectations $\mathbf{f}[p]$ and applying the Azuma-Hoeffding inequality, as proposed in [3]. Note that we do not claim this sub-procedure to be optimal for a finite number of rounds n.

Let $(\vec{a}, \vec{x})$ be the output-input sequence obtained in a certain realization of the n-round protocol. We define the *observed frequencies* as an estimation of the average behavior of the device based on the observed data,

$$\hat{p}(a|x) = \frac{\#(a,x)}{n\pi(x)}\,, \tag{17}$$

where $\#(a,x)$ is the number of occurrences of the output-input pair (a,x) in the n rounds. As with probabilities, we refer to the full set of observed frequencies $(\hat{p}(a|x))$ as a vector $\hat{p}$.

We define resulting estimators for the Bell expressions by substituting $\hat{p}$ for p in (1):

$$\mathbf{f}[\hat{p}] = \sum_{a,x} \mathbf{f}(a,x)\hat{p}(a|x) = \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{\mathbf{f}(a_i,x_i)}{\pi(x_i)}\,. \tag{18}$$

To ease the notation, in the following we sometimes write $\hat{\mathbf{f}}$ instead of $\mathbf{f}[\hat{p}]$. It should be kept in mind that $\hat{p}$ and $\hat{\mathbf{f}}$ are random variables, being functions of the observed event $(\vec{a}, \vec{x})$.

As shown in [3], a simple application of the Azuma-Hoeffding inequality yields the following result:

Lemma 4. *For any $\alpha = 1, \ldots, t$, let $\epsilon_\alpha^\pm > 0$ and let*

$$\mu_\alpha^\pm = \nu_\alpha \sqrt{\frac{2}{n} \ln \frac{1}{\epsilon_\alpha^\pm}}\,, \tag{19}$$

where

$$\nu_\alpha \geq \max_{p\in\mathcal{Q}} \max_{a,x} \left| \frac{f_\alpha(a,x)}{\pi(x)} - f_\alpha[p] \right|. \tag{20}$$

Then

$$\Pr\left[\frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^{n} f_\alpha[p_{\vec{a}_{j-1},\vec{x}_{j-1}}] \leq \hat{f}_\alpha + \mu_\alpha^+ \right] \geq 1 - \epsilon_\alpha^+ \tag{21}$$

and

$$\Pr\left[\frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^{n} f_\alpha[p_{\vec{a}_{j-1},\vec{x}_{j-1}}] \geq \hat{f}_\alpha - \mu_\alpha^- \right] \geq 1 - \epsilon_\alpha^-\,. \tag{22}$$

Lemma 4 simply states that with high probability the n-round average $\frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^{n} f_\alpha[p_{\vec{a}_{j-1},\vec{x}_{j-1}}]$, conditioned on the past, is no greater (no smaller) than the observed value $\hat{f}_\alpha$ plus (minus) some deviation μ_α^+ (μ_α^-). This deviation tends to zero as $1/\sqrt{n}$ and directly depends on the quantity ν_α, which represents an upper bound on the maximum possible value of $|f_\alpha(a,x)/\pi(x) - f_\alpha[p]|$, that is to say, the maximal extent to which the random variable $f_\alpha(a,x)/\pi(x)$ can differ from its expectation $f_\alpha[p]$. In other words, ν_α bounds the possible statistical fluctuations which our observations can be subject to. A specific value for ν_α is given by

$$\tilde{\nu}_\alpha = \max\left\{ \max_{a,x} \frac{f_\alpha(a,x)}{\pi(x)} - \min_{p\in\mathcal{Q}} f_\alpha[p],\ \max_{p\in\mathcal{Q}} f_\alpha[p] - \min_{a,x} \frac{f_\alpha(a,x)}{\pi(x)} \right\}. \tag{23}$$

The terms $\max_{a,x} \frac{f_\alpha(a,x)}{\pi(x)}$ and $\min_{a,x} \frac{f_\alpha(a,x)}{\pi(x)}$ are easy to calculate, while the terms $\max_{p\in\mathcal{Q}} f_\alpha[p]$ and $\min_{p\in\mathcal{Q}} f_\alpha[p]$ can be computed through SDP using a NPA relaxation.

We can combine the above upper and lower bounds for all α through a union bound to get the following confidence region:

Lemma 5. *Given $\epsilon_\alpha^\pm \geq 0$ for $\alpha = 1, \ldots, t$, let $\hat{\mathbf{f}}^\pm$ be the vector $(\hat{f}_1^\pm, \ldots, \hat{f}_t^\pm)$, where*

$$\hat{f}_\alpha^\pm = \begin{cases} \hat{f}_\alpha \pm \nu_\alpha \sqrt{\frac{2}{n} \ln \frac{1}{\epsilon_\alpha^\pm}} & \text{if } \epsilon_\alpha^\pm > 0\,, \\ \pm\infty & \text{if } \epsilon_\alpha^\pm = 0\,, \end{cases} \tag{24}$$

with $\hat{f}_\alpha$ as defined in eq. (18) and ν_α as defined in eq. (20).

Let the confidence region

$$\mathcal{V} = [\hat{\mathbf{f}}^-, \hat{\mathbf{f}}^+] = \{\mathbf{f} \in \mathbb{R}^t \,:\, \hat{\mathbf{f}}^- \leq \mathbf{f} \leq \hat{\mathbf{f}}^+\}. \tag{25}$$

Then

$$\Pr\left[\frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^{n} \mathbf{f}[p_{\vec{a}_{j-1},\,\vec{x}_{j-1}}] \in [\hat{\mathbf{f}}^-, \hat{\mathbf{f}}^+]\right] \geq 1 - \epsilon\,, \tag{26}$$

where $\epsilon = \sum_{\alpha=1}^t (\epsilon_\alpha^+ + \epsilon_\alpha^-)$.

In eq. (25) the inequalities $\hat{\mathbf{f}}^- \leq \mathbf{f} \leq \hat{\mathbf{f}}^+$—as all other vector inequalities in this paper—should be understood to hold component-wise, i.e., $\hat{f}_\alpha^- \leq f_\alpha \leq \hat{f}_\alpha^+$ for all α.

Note that when $\epsilon_\alpha^+ = 0$ (or $\epsilon_\alpha^- = 0$), we are simply not putting any bound on $\frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^n \mathbf{f}[p_{\vec{a}_{j-1},\vec{x}_{j-1}}]$ from above (or below). Indeed, it is not always useful to bound a Bell expression from both directions. Consider, for instance, the CHSH expression. It is well-known that the amount of certifiable randomness increases with the absolute value of the CHSH violation, increasing from 2 (the maximal local value) to $2\sqrt{2}$ (the maximal quantum value) and from -2 (the minimal local value) to $-2\sqrt{2}$ (the minimal quantum value). If we are estimating the randomness produced by our Bell device based only on the CHSH expression f_{chsh}, and strongly expect the CHSH expectation to be in the region $[2, 2\sqrt{2}]$, then it is certainly desirable to lower-bound it as accurately as possible. However, we have no interest in knowing that it is smaller than some value (since the randomness which can be certified is only affected by the lower bound in the region). For a given $\epsilon = \epsilon_{\text{chsh}}^+ + \epsilon_{\text{chsh}}^-$, we are therefore interested in setting $\epsilon_{\text{chsh}}^+ = 0$, so that ϵ_{chsh}^- is as large as possible, and thus $\hat{f}_{\text{chsh}}^-$ is as close as possible to $\hat{f}_{\text{chsh}}$. However, if we have no a priori reason to expect the CHSH expression to lie in one region or the other, $\epsilon_{\text{chsh}}^\pm = \epsilon/2$ is the most natural choice.

5 Bounding single-round randomness

In Section 3 we showed how to put a bound on the randomness produced by a Bell device which is used n times in succession, given a function G satisfying certain properties. We now discuss the meaning of G and how to compute it in practice.

The function G is defined through two properties, as specified in Definition 1. These properties represent the minimal requirements needed to derive our results. Nevertheless, on a more intuitive level, they are also sensible requirements, providing an interpretation of the function G as a DI bound on the randomness of the sequence of outputs produced by the Bell device.

Let us first discuss the meaning of condition 1 in Definition 1, that is, the condition that $p(a|x) \leq G(\mathbf{f}[p])$ for all $a \in \mathcal{A}$, all $x \in \mathcal{X}_r$, and all $p \in \mathcal{Q}$. First, note that if the only thing an adversary knows about a Bell device is that its outputs are determined according to the probabilities p, the maximum over all a of $p(a|x)$ is a measure of the output randomness for the input x. Indeed, this is nothing but the optimal probability with which the adversary can correctly guess the outputs of the Bell device given her knowledge. The lower this quantity, the higher the output randomness.

Generally, we may however be interested in bounding the output randomness not only for a single input x, but simultaneously for a subset $\mathcal{X}_r$ of all the inputs. Condition 1 thus requires the bound on $p(a|x)$ to hold for all inputs $x \in \mathcal{X}_r$. In addition, we assume that our Bell device is actually only

characterized by the Bell expectations $\mathbf{f}[p]$, and generally not the full behavior p. In the DI spirit, we thus seek the worst-case bound over all quantum behaviors $p \in \mathcal{Q}$ compatible with $\mathbf{f}[p]$. Eventually, we thus arrive at condition 1, as formulated.

To satisfy this condition, we could simply define

$$\begin{aligned} G(\mathbf{f}[p]) = \max_{p'} \max_{a\in\mathcal{A}, x\in\mathcal{X}_r} \quad & p'(a|x) \\ \text{subject to} \quad & \mathbf{f}[p'] = \mathbf{f}[p], \quad p' \in \mathcal{Q}\,. \end{aligned} \tag{27}$$

However, consider a behavior p which can be written as the convex combination $p = q\,p_1 + (1-q)\,p_2$, where $0 \leq q \leq 1$. We note that $G(\mathbf{f}[p]) = G(q\,\mathbf{f}[p_1] + (1-q)\,\mathbf{f}[p_2]) = q\,p'(a|x) + (1-q)\,p'(a|x)$ for a certain output-input pair (a, x) and a certain p' (namely, the optimal ones). It may be the case that for $\mathbf{f}[p_1]$ and $\mathbf{f}[p_2]$, the corresponding optimal value $G(\mathbf{f}[p_1])$ and $G(\mathbf{f}[p_2])$ are not attained for (a, x) and p', and thus that either $p'(a, x) < G(\mathbf{f}[p_1])$, or $p'(a, x) < G(\mathbf{f}[p_2])$, or both. We would then deduce that $G(q\,\mathbf{f}[p_1] + (1-q)\,\mathbf{f}[p_2]) < q\,G(\mathbf{f}[p_1]) + (1-q)\,G(\mathbf{f}[p_2])$. Indeed, it is not difficult to construct explicit examples where this happens. Physically, this is problematic because the quantity $q\,G(\mathbf{f}[p_1])+(1-q)\,G(\mathbf{f}[p_2])$ represents the randomness from the perspective of someone (e.g., an adversary) who knows at each round if the Bell device behaves according to p_1 or if it behaves according to p_2. Since $G(q\,\mathbf{f}[p_1]+(1-q)\,\mathbf{f}[p_2])$ is lower than this quantity, eq. (27) overestimates the randomness produced by the Bell device (recall that the lower G, the higher the randomness). Since we want our bound to hold even in a DI setting where we cannot exclude the possibility that someone has a more detailed description of the Bell devices than we do—and, in particular, has access to some shared classical data specifying which of the probabilities p_1 or p_2 are actually realized at any given time—we must require that $G(q\,\mathbf{f}[p_1] + (1-q)\,\mathbf{f}[p_2]) \geq q\,G(\mathbf{f}[p_1]) + (1-q)\,G(\mathbf{f}[p_2])$; that is, the function G must be concave, as expressed in condition 2.

This last requirement can be met if we simply convexify eq. (27); that is, if we explicitly allow for arbitrary convex combinations $\sum_{\lambda\in\Lambda} q_\lambda p_\lambda$ and optimize over them:

$$\begin{aligned} G(\mathbf{f}[p]) = \max_{\{q_\lambda, p_\lambda\}_{\lambda\in\Lambda}} \quad & \sum_{\lambda\in\Lambda} q_\lambda \max_{a\in\mathcal{A}, x\in\mathcal{X}_r} p_\lambda(a|x) \\ \text{subject to} \quad & \sum_{\lambda\in\Lambda} q_\lambda = 1, \quad q_\lambda \geq 0 \quad \forall\lambda\in\Lambda, \\ & \sum_{\lambda\in\Lambda} q_\lambda\,\mathbf{f}[p_\lambda] = \mathbf{f}[p], \\ & p_\lambda \in \mathcal{Q} \quad \forall\lambda\in\Lambda. \end{aligned} \tag{28}$$

We have thus arrived at a formulation of G as an optimization program. By definition the function G is concave, and it is easy to see that it satisfies condition 1.

Physically, we can interpret the optimization program eq. (28) as follows. Suppose first that the set $\mathcal{X}_r$ contains a single input x. Given a Bell device characterized by the Bell expectations $\mathbf{f}[p]$, assume that an adversary is actually able to prepare it into one of many states p_λ each occurring with probability q_λ, such that on average it reproduces the given Bell expectations: $\sum_\lambda q_\lambda \mathbf{f}[p_\lambda] = \mathbf{f}[p]$. For every λ, the best probability to guess correctly what will turn out to be the output if the input x is used is clearly $\max_{a\in\mathcal{A}} p_\lambda(a|x)$. The above program thus maximizes the adversary's average guessing probability over all possible strategies. It is essentially identical to the one introduced in [19, 20]. The difference with [19, 20] is that we characterize the devices through an arbitrary number of Bell expectations $\mathbf{f}[p]$, rather than a single Bell expression or the full set of probabilities $p(a|x)$.

If $\mathcal{X}_r$ contains more than one input, then the interpretation of the above program is a little bit more subtle. For every λ, $\max_{a\in\mathcal{A}, x\in\mathcal{X}_r} p_\lambda(a|x)$ can be interpreted as a bound on the output randomness for every input in $\mathcal{X}_r$. Indeed, it actually corresponds to the optimal probability that the adversary can guess correctly the output for the case of the input in $\mathcal{X}_r$ that is the most favorable from her point of view. In this sense, the above program thus also maximizes the adversary's average randomness. However, note that the input for which the maximum is reached in $\max_{a\in\mathcal{A}, x\in\mathcal{X}_r} p_\lambda(a|x)$ can change as we vary λ. Thus if we want to interpret operationally the objective function (first line of (28)) as an average guessing probability, we have to assume that the adversary is free to chose, depending on her knowledge λ, which input in $\mathcal{X}_r$ is the one for which she should attempt to guess the output.

The optimization problem (28) is only one possible way to characterize the randomness of a subset of inputs. Other suggestions have been made in [20]. The main reason for the present choice is that it satisfies the mathematical properties that are needed in our n-round analysis.

To apply our n-round analysis, we actually do not need to compute the value $G(\mathbf{f}[p])$ for a fixed value $\mathbf{f}[p]$, but instead its worst-case bound over all quantum behaviors $p \in \mathcal{Q}$ for which $\mathbf{f}[p] \in \mathcal{V}$. If the confidence region $\mathcal{V}$ is defined as an interval $[\hat{\mathbf{f}}^-, \hat{\mathbf{f}}^+]$, as in the preceding section, this can simply be cast as the following optimization problem:

$$\begin{aligned} G([\hat{\mathbf{f}}^-, \hat{\mathbf{f}}^+]) = \max_{\{q_\lambda, p_\lambda\}_{\lambda\in\Lambda}} \quad & \sum_{\lambda\in\Lambda} q_\lambda \max_{a\in\mathcal{A}, x\in\mathcal{X}_r} p_\lambda(a|x) \\ \text{subject to} \quad & \sum_{\lambda\in\Lambda} q_\lambda = 1, \quad q_\lambda \geq 0 \quad \forall \lambda \in \Lambda, \\ & \hat{\mathbf{f}}^- \leq \sum_{\lambda\in\Lambda} q_\lambda \, \mathbf{f}[p_\lambda] \leq \hat{\mathbf{f}}^+, \\ & p_\lambda \in \mathcal{Q} \quad \forall \lambda \in \Lambda. \end{aligned} \tag{29}$$

When $[\hat{\mathbf{f}}^-, \hat{\mathbf{f}}^+] \cap \mathbf{f}[\mathcal{Q}] = \emptyset$, the optimization problem is infeasible. In accordance with Definition 1, in that case we let $G([\hat{\mathbf{f}}^-, \hat{\mathbf{f}}^+]) = 1$.

Let us now discuss how one can compute $G(\mathbf{f}[p])$ or $G([\hat{\mathbf{f}}^-, \hat{\mathbf{f}}^+])$ generically. For this, let us apply the two tricks in [19, 20]. First, one can absorb the weights q_λ in the unnormalized behaviors $\tilde{p}_\lambda = q_\lambda p_\lambda$. Second, one can group together the preparations $\tilde{p}_\lambda$ for which the maximum $\max_{a\in\mathcal{A}, x\in\mathcal{X}_r} \tilde{p}_\lambda(a|x)$ is attained for the same values of (a, x). We thus end up with a finite number $|\mathcal{A}| \times |\mathcal{X}_r|$ of preparations, that we index by the corresponding values of (a, x), and such that $\max_{a'\in\mathcal{A}, x'\in\mathcal{X}_r} \tilde{p}_{a,x}(a'|x') = \tilde{p}_{a,x}(a|x)$. This leads to the formulation

$$\begin{aligned} G(\mathbf{f}[p]) = \max_{\{\tilde{p}_{a,x}\}_{a\in\mathcal{A}, x\in\mathcal{X}_r}} \quad & \sum_{a\in\mathcal{A}, x\in\mathcal{X}_r} \tilde{p}_{a,x}(a|x) \\ \text{subject to} \quad & \sum_{a\in\mathcal{A}, x\in\mathcal{X}_r} \mathrm{Tr}[\tilde{p}_{a,x}] = 1, \\ & \sum_{a\in\mathcal{A}, x\in\mathcal{X}_r} \mathbf{f}[\tilde{p}_{a,x}] = \mathbf{f}[p], \\ & \tilde{p}_{a,x} \in \tilde{\mathcal{Q}} \quad \forall a \in \mathcal{A}, \forall x \in \mathcal{X}_r. \end{aligned} \tag{30}$$

where $\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}$ denotes the set of unnormalized quantum behaviors. The conditions $q_\lambda \geq 0$ and $p_\lambda \in \mathcal{Q}$ are equivalent to the single condition $\tilde{p}_\lambda \in \tilde{\mathcal{Q}}$. The condition $\sum_\lambda q_\lambda = 1$ becomes $\sum_\lambda \mathrm{Tr}[\tilde{p}_\lambda] = 1$ where $\mathrm{Tr}[p] = \sum_a p(a|x)$ is the norm of p (by no-signaling, this expression is independent of the choice of x, and it is equal to 1 for normalized behaviors).

Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned} G([\hat{\mathbf{f}}^-, \hat{\mathbf{f}}^+]) = \max_{\{\tilde{p}_{a,x}\}_{a\in\mathcal{A}, x\in\mathcal{X}_r}} \quad & \sum_{a\in\mathcal{A}, x\in\mathcal{X}_r} \tilde{p}_{a,x}(a|x) \\ \text{subject to} \quad & \sum_{a\in\mathcal{A}, x\in\mathcal{X}_r} \mathrm{Tr}[\tilde{p}_{a,x}] = 1, \\ & \hat{\mathbf{f}}^- \leq \sum_{a\in\mathcal{A}, x\in\mathcal{X}_r} \mathbf{f}[\tilde{p}_{a,x}] \leq \hat{\mathbf{f}}^+, \\ & \tilde{p}_{a,x} \in \tilde{\mathcal{Q}} \quad \forall a \in \mathcal{A}, \forall x \in \mathcal{X}_r. \end{aligned} \tag{31}$$

The problems (30) and (31) cannot be solved in general since the set $\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}$ is hard to characterize. But one can replace it with one of its NPA relaxations, in which case the two problems become SDPs (since apart from the condition $\tilde{p}_{a,x} \in \tilde{\mathcal{Q}}$ all constraints and the objective function are linear). They will, though, in general only yield an upper bound on the optimal value G, but this is sufficient for our purpose.

In the Appendix, we provide more intuition about the above problems by considering their dual formulations. We also discuss in more detail their link with [19, 20].

6 Summary of the protocol

In the two preceding sections, we have specified a way of bounding the randomness within a $(1-\epsilon)$ confidence region $\mathcal{V} = [\hat{\mathbf{f}}^-, \hat{\mathbf{f}}^+]$ around the observed statistic $\mathbf{f}[\hat{p}]$. We can thus apply Theorem 1 to bound the min-entropy of the output string obtained after n uses of the device. Processing this raw string with a suitable extractor finally leads to a uniformly random and private string. The resulting protocol is summarized in Figure 1.

Arguments:

- $D(k, \mathcal{X}, \mathcal{A})$: a Bell device as described in Section 2, consisting of k black boxes taking joint inputs in $\mathcal{X}$ and producing joint outputs in $\mathcal{A}$.
- $\mathcal{X}_r \subseteq \mathcal{X}$: a subset of all inputs (ideally this set should contain the inputs from which we expect to obtain the most randomness).
- $\pi(x)$: the distribution of inputs at each round.
- $\mathbf{f} = \{f_\alpha\}_{\alpha=1,\ldots,t}$: the t Bell expressions used to estimate the device behavior.
- $\{\nu_\alpha\}$: an upper bound on statistical fluctuations, defined in eq. (20).
- n: the number of measurement rounds.
- l: the level of the NPA relaxation used to solve the randomness-bounding SDP.
- H: the threshold used to determine if the protocol succeeds or aborts.
- ϵ, ϵ': the two security parameters involved in Theorem 1. The parameter ϵ should itself be decomposed into the $2t$ parameters $\epsilon_\alpha^\pm$ such that $\epsilon = \sum_\alpha \epsilon_\alpha^- + \epsilon_\alpha^+$.

Protocol:

1. Operate the device n rounds in succession: at each round j, choose the k-tuple of inputs x_j according to distribution $\pi(x_j)$ and obtain the k-tuple of outputs a_j. After n rounds obtain the input-output string $(\vec{x}, \vec{a})$.
2. Determine
   (a) the confidence region $\mathcal{V} = [\hat{\mathbf{f}}^-, \hat{\mathbf{f}}^+]$, defined by equations (24)-(25), which depends on $(\vec{x}, \vec{a})$, $\{\nu_\alpha\}$, $\{\epsilon_\alpha^\pm\}$ and n;
   (b) $\gamma(\vec{x})$, the number of inputs not in $\mathcal{X}_r$, defined by eq. (5).
3. Calculate $G(\mathcal{V})$ as defined in program (29) and using level l of the NPA hierarchy.
4. Determine whether $-\log_2(G^n(\mathcal{V})\tau^{\gamma(\vec{x})})$ is above the threshold H
   (a) if not, abort;
   (b) if yes, apply a $(m, h, \epsilon_{\text{ext}})$-extractor, where m is the extractor output length, $h = H - \log_2 \frac{1}{\epsilon'}$ is the min-entropy bound given by Theorem 1, and ϵ_{ext} the extractor's security parameter (see [14]).

Figure 1: DIRNG protocol following from Theorem 1 (Section 3) and from the results of Sections 4, 5.

As we noted in Section 3, one can define a similar protocol based on a sequence of thresholds $H_0 < H_1 < \cdots < H_\ell$ rather than a single one, introducing intermediate levels of success in the protocol. One advantage of this is that we do not need to determine what threshold we expect the device to reach and risk failing the protocol with high probability if we overestimated H. See Section III.D of [14] for details.

7 Discussion

We have introduced a family of protocols, each characterized by a choice of t Bell expressions f_α, a randomness-generating input set $\mathcal{X}_r$, and an input distribution $\pi(x)$.

Note first that this family contains as a special case the protocols introduced in [3, 14, 15]. These correspond to the case where a single Bell expression f is used ($t = 1$) and where the randomness-bounding function covers all inputs ($\mathcal{X}_r = \mathcal{X}$). The main novelty introduced in the present work is that we can take into account information from more Bell expressions ($t \geq 1$) and can tailor the randomness analysis to a subset of all possible inputs ($\mathcal{X}_r \subseteq \mathcal{X}$).

Before discussing these new aspects, let us briefly go over the case $t = 1$ and $\mathcal{X}_r = \mathcal{X}$.

7.1 Bounding randomness for all inputs with one Bell expression ($\mathcal{X}_r = \mathcal{X}$, $t = 1$)

In this case, $\gamma(\vec{x})$, the number of inputs not in $\mathcal{X}_r$, is always equal to zero, and according to Theorem 1, the min-entropy of the output string is roughly equal to $-n \log_2 G(\mathcal{V})$. Furthermore, the confidence region $\mathcal{V}$ reduces to a confidence interval $[\hat{f}^-, \hat{f}^+]$ around the estimated Bell violation $\hat{f}$. Usually, the values of $\hat{f}$ that we expect to obtain in the protocol will fall in a region where $G(\hat{f})$ is either monotonically decreasing or increasing with $\hat{f}$, i.e., the interval is within either the upward- or downward-sloped region of the concave function $G(\hat{f})$. For instance, if f is the CHSH expression, we may assume that the devices have been designed so that with very high probability $\hat{f} \geq 2$. In that region, $G(\hat{f})$ is indeed decreasing with $\hat{f}$ (i.e., the randomness increases for increasing values of the CHSH expression). Let us assume for definiteness that G is decreasing (the same kind of reasoning can be done if G is increasing). Since we are looking for the maximal value of G in the region $\mathcal{V}$ (see Lemma 2), it is then sufficient, as done in [3, 14, 15], to take a one-sided interval $[\hat{f}^-, \infty[$, and the maximal value of G in the interval will then be $G(\hat{f}^-)$. Considering again our CHSH example, we are interested in a guarantee that the CHSH value is above some threshold, which determines the randomness we can certify in the worst case, but it is useless to know that it is bounded from above (see also discussion at the end of Section 4). Taking the definition eq. (24) for $\hat{f}^-$, we thus get that the min-entropy of the output string is bounded (roughly speaking[1], and up to the $-\log_2(1/\epsilon')$ correction) as

$$H_{\min} \gtrsim -n \log_2 G\left(\hat{f} - \nu\sqrt{\frac{2}{n}\ln\frac{1}{\epsilon}}\right). \tag{32}$$

This is precisely the result of [3, 14, 15], whose interpretation is quite intuitive: the min-entropy after n runs is equal to n times the min-entropy for a single run, evaluated on the observed Bell violation $\hat{f}$ offset by a statistical parameter $\mu = \nu\sqrt{(2/n)\ln(1/\epsilon)}$. This correction accounts for the fact that even if a device has been built such that it produces a target Bell violation, statistical fluctuations may push the observed violation above what is expected.

This statistical correction depends on the security parameter ϵ and decreases with the number of runs n. It also depends on the prefactor ν defined in eq. (20). This prefactor depends on the choice of Bell expression f, and also importantly on the input distribution $\pi(x)$.

As discussed in [3, 14], the input distribution can be suitably chosen to optimize the ratio $R_{\text{out}}/R_{\text{in}}$ of the randomness that is produced to the randomness that is consumed when choosing the inputs. The idea is that if at each run one selects with very high probability a given input $x = x^*$, then the resulting distribution $\pi(x)$ can be sampled from a small number of initial uniform bits R_{in}, which should improve the ratio $R_{\text{out}}/R_{\text{in}}$. However, this will also lower R_{out} because observations involving the other inputs $x \neq x^*$ will be less frequent, which will reduce the statistical accuracy. Consider for instance, as in [3, 14], the case where the input x^* is chosen with probability $\pi(x^*) = 1 - \kappa n^{-\delta}$ for some constants κ and δ, and the other inputs are chosen with probability $\pi(x) = \kappa' n^{-\delta}$, where $\kappa' = \kappa/(|\mathcal{X}| - 1)$ for normalization.

[1] Equation (32) and the similar approximate bounds that follow should be understood as informal statements giving an order of magnitude for the min-entropy lower bound. Contrary to the statement of Theorem 1, this informal bound directly involves the estimator $\hat{f}$, which is a random variable. As such, it might be subject to improbable but extreme fluctuations, in which case the bound does not correctly characterize the device. In comparison, the min-entropy bound of Theorem 1 is expressed in terms of a fixed threshold. Furthermore, the theorem also accounts for the unlikely event that a device reaches this threshold only by chance.

Then the initial randomness R_{in} required to choose the inputs according to this distribution will be of size $O(n^{1-\delta}\ln n^{\delta})$. On the other hand, according to eq. (32), the output randomness will be of size $\Omega(n)$ as long as the statistical correction, of order $\nu/\sqrt{n}$, remains bounded by a constant. Since, according to eq. (20), $\nu \simeq 1/(\min_x \pi(x))$ we get that the statistical correction is of order $\nu/\sqrt{n} = O(n^{\delta-\frac{1}{2}})$ and thus that we should take $\delta \leq \frac{1}{2}$. We can thus hope at best a quadratic expansion wherein $O(n^{\frac{1}{2}}\ln n^{\frac{1}{2}})$ initial bits are consumed and $\Omega(n)$ are produced.

Note that the initial randomness for choosing the inputs only needs to be random with respect to the devices, but can be publicly announced to the adversary without compromising the privacy of the output string [14, 25]. One can thus view the above protocols as producing private randomness from public randomness. From this perspective, the "expansion" efficiency of the protocol is less relevant since the final and initial randomness correspond to different resources that do not necessarily have to be compared on the same footing.

7.2 Bounding randomness from a subset of all inputs ($\mathcal{X}_r \subseteq \mathcal{X}$)

Having reviewed the case $t = 1$ and $\mathcal{X}_r = \mathcal{X}$, we proceed to consider the modifications introduced in this work. We consider first the possibility $\mathcal{X}_r \subset \mathcal{X}$. This means that the RB function G is only required to non-trivially bound the output probability for inputs that are in the set $\mathcal{X}_r$. This is an important feature because for many Bell expressions the randomness that can be certified depends on the input used. For instance, maximal violation of the tilted-CHSH inequalities [21] may imply that the randomness is maximal for one input pair but near zero for another input pair. Using a function which is simultaneously randomness-bounding for all inputs $x \in \mathcal{X}$ would then be highly sub-optimal in this case. This aspect is particularly important for photonic implementations of DI protocols: recent photonic Bell tests rely on partially entangled states [26–29], for which the optimal extraction of randomness requires the use of a specific input.

According to our analysis, in the case $\mathcal{X}_r \subseteq \mathcal{X}$, the bound (32) becomes

$$H_{\min} \gtrsim -n\log_2 G\left(\hat{f} - \nu\sqrt{\frac{2}{n}\ln\frac{1}{\epsilon}}\right) - \gamma(\vec{x})\log_2\tau\,, \tag{33}$$

where G is now a RB function for $\mathcal{X}_r$, which will generally yield an improvement over a RB function that is required to be valid for all of $\mathcal{X}$. Our analysis, however, introduces a penalty term of the form $\gamma(\vec{x})\log_2\tau$, where $\tau \leq |\mathcal{A}|$ is bounded by a constant and $\gamma(\vec{x})$ is the number of inputs not in $\mathcal{X}_r$ that have been observed. To keep this penalty term as low as possible, we should choose inputs in $\mathcal{X}_{\bar{r}} = \mathcal{X} \setminus \mathcal{X}_r$ with a low probability. One possibility, compatible with our previous discussion about the introduction of a bias in the input distribution, is to take $\pi(x) = \kappa' n^{-\delta}$ for $x \in \mathcal{X}_{\bar{r}}$, in which case the expected value of $\gamma(\vec{x})$ would be $|\mathcal{X}_{\bar{r}}|\kappa' n^{1-\delta}$. This is negligible asymptotically with respect to the main term of (33), which is $\Omega(n)$, provided that $\delta > 0$.

Note that in certain cases, the RB function may be insensitive to the choice of $\mathcal{X}_r$. For instance, in the case of the CHSH inequality, which is highly symmetric and treats all inputs on the same footing, any RB function returns the same bound on the randomness independently of the choice of $\mathcal{X}_r$, and in particular when $\mathcal{X}_r = \mathcal{X}$. Thus the choice of $\mathcal{X}_r$ will not impact the main term of (33) but only the penalty term, which will vanish if $|\mathcal{X}_{\bar{r}}| = 0$. In such situations, it is therefore preferable to take $\mathcal{X}_r = \mathcal{X}$, as in [3, 14].

We now illustrate the application of our protocol on a concrete example where we take $\mathcal{X}_r \subset \mathcal{X}$. The scenario in this example has two parties ($k = 2$), two measurement settings per party ($\mathcal{X} = \{0,1\}^2$), and two outcome possibilities per measurement ($\mathcal{A} = \{0,1\}^2$). We considered a device behavior

$$p = vp_{\text{ext}} + (1-v)u \tag{34}$$

arising from a mixture of white noise u and the extremal quantum behavior p_{ext} that achieves maximal violation of the I_1^β tilted-CHSH inequality as introduced in [21], with $\beta = 2\cos(2\theta)/\sqrt{1+\sin^2(2\theta)}$ for $\theta = \pi/8$. This extremal behavior can be achieved by a pair of partially entangled qubits $|\phi\rangle = \cos\theta\,|00\rangle + \sin\theta\,|11\rangle$.

The resulting correlations have the property of giving more predictable outcomes for a subset of measurement inputs. For $\theta = \pi/8$, the two measurement settings that give more predictable outcomes,

$x = (0,0)$ and $x = (0,1)$, have a guessing probability of about 0.775 in the ideal ($v = 1$) case where I_1^β is maximally violated. On the other hand, the two measurement settings with less predictable outcomes, $x = (1,0)$ and $x = (1,1)$, have guessing probabilities of about 0.496. We chose one of those last two settings as our input subset for randomness generation: $\mathcal{X}_r = \{(1,0)\}$. (Note the difference in notation from [21]: we relabeled the inputs 1 and 2 to 0 and 1, respectively.)

We then generated random samples of n input-output pairs $\vec{a}, \vec{x}$ from the corresponding behavior p with the following input distribution

$$\pi(x) = \begin{cases} 1 - \frac{3}{4} n^{-1/10} & \text{if } x = (1,0)\,, \\ \frac{1}{4} n^{-1/10} & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \tag{35}$$

We performed this sampling independently for different values of n between 100 and 3×10^{18}. As n grows, the input distribution becomes strongly biased to select $x = (1,0) \in \mathcal{X}_r$ most of the time. For low n, when $\pi(x = (1,0)) < \pi(x \neq (1,0))$, we instead distribute the inputs uniformly, in order to avoid biasing *against* the randomness-generating input $x = (1,0)$.

We estimate three different Bell expressions, all defined in terms of the following correlators:

$$\langle A_{\mathrm{x}_1} \rangle = \sum_{\mathrm{a}_1,\mathrm{a}_2,\mathrm{x}_2 \in \{0,1\}} (-1)^{\mathrm{a}_1} \pi_2(\mathrm{x}_2|\mathrm{x}_1) p(\mathrm{a}_1\mathrm{a}_2|\mathrm{x}_1\mathrm{x}_2) \qquad \mathrm{x}_1 \in \{0,1\}, \tag{36a}$$

$$\langle B_{\mathrm{x}_2} \rangle = \sum_{\mathrm{a}_1,\mathrm{a}_2,\mathrm{x}_1 \in \{0,1\}} (-1)^{\mathrm{a}_2} \pi_1(\mathrm{x}_1|\mathrm{x}_2) p(\mathrm{a}_1\mathrm{a}_2|\mathrm{x}_1\mathrm{x}_2) \qquad \mathrm{x}_2 \in \{0,1\}, \tag{36b}$$

$$\langle A_{\mathrm{x}_1} B_{\mathrm{x}_2} \rangle = \sum_{\mathrm{a}_1,\mathrm{a}_2 \in \{0,1\}} (-1)^{\mathrm{a}_1+\mathrm{a}_2} p(\mathrm{a}_1\mathrm{a}_2|\mathrm{x}_1\mathrm{x}_2) \qquad \mathrm{x}_1,\mathrm{x}_2 \in \{0,1\}. \tag{36c}$$

The weights $\pi_1(\mathrm{x}_1|\mathrm{x}_2)$ and $\pi_2(\mathrm{x}_2|\mathrm{x}_1)$ represent the respective marginals of the joint input distribution $\pi(\mathrm{x}_1\mathrm{x}_2)$.[2]

The expressions we evaluate are the CHSH expression

$$I_{\mathrm{chsh}} = \langle A_0 B_0 \rangle + \langle A_0 B_1 \rangle + \langle A_1 B_0 \rangle - \langle A_1 B_1 \rangle\,, \tag{37}$$

the tilted-CHSH expression

$$I_1^\beta = \beta \langle A_0 \rangle + \langle A_0 B_0 \rangle + \langle A_0 B_1 \rangle + \langle A_1 B_0 \rangle - \langle A_1 B_1 \rangle\,, \tag{38}$$

and the "optimal" expression for the chosen device behavior (34):

$$\begin{aligned} I_p = 10.610 &- 1.859\langle A_0 \rangle - 1.733\langle A_1 \rangle + 0.499\langle B_0 \rangle - 2.196\langle B_1 \rangle \\ &- 3.109\langle A_0 B_0 \rangle - 2.945\langle A_0 B_1 \rangle - 2.610\langle A_1 B_0 \rangle + 4.343\langle A_1 B_1 \rangle\,. \end{aligned} \tag{39}$$

This last Bell expression is the optimal Bell expression in the following sense. As already observed in [19, 20], the dual of problem (28) (see eq. (47) in the Appendix), when applied to a device characterized by its full behavior (i.e., $f_{a,x}[p] = p(a|x)$ so that $\mathbf{f}[p] = p$), finds a Bell expression I_p such that the amount of randomness certified from $I_p[p]$ is equal to the amount of randomness that can be certified from the entire table of probabilities $p(a|x)$. Thus, to each device behavior p is associated a single Bell expression I_p that is optimal for p from the point of view of randomness.[3] Note that if we had taken $v = 1$ for the considered correlations, I_p would be equivalent to I_1^β.

[2] Note that for a no-signaling behavior, we could equivalently use any arbitrary set of probability weights in place of $\pi_1(\mathrm{x}_1|\mathrm{x}_2)$ or $\pi_2(\mathrm{x}_2|\mathrm{x}_1)$. We choose this specific set of weights because it provides a better estimator for the marginal correlators $\langle A_{\mathrm{x}_1} \rangle$ and $\langle B_{\mathrm{x}_2} \rangle$ when applied to the observed frequencies $\hat{p}(\mathrm{a}_1\mathrm{a}_2|\mathrm{x}_1\mathrm{x}_2)$. Indeed, it can be seen from the definition of a Bell estimator $f[\hat{p}]$ in eq. (18) that the marginal correlators reduce to a natural definition based on locally available data resulting only from the respective party's interaction with their part of the device, namely, $\langle A_{\mathrm{x}_1} \rangle = \sum_{\mathrm{a}_1} (-1)^{\mathrm{a}_1} \#(\mathrm{a}_1, \mathrm{x}_1)/(n\pi_1(x_1))$, and similarly for $\langle B_{\mathrm{x}_2} \rangle$.

[3] More accurately, there exist infinitely many Bell expressions that are equivalent to I_p up to terms that vanish for no-signaling behaviors. In order to pick one that tolerates the small signaling fluctuations present in our behavior estimator $\hat{p}$, we run the computation of I_p in the 8-dimensional space of correlators, rather than the overspecified 16-dimensional parametrization of quantum behaviors in terms of the probabilities $p(\mathrm{a}_1\mathrm{a}_2|\mathrm{x}_1\mathrm{x}_2)$. We translate this expression back to a unique standard form (1) using definition (36) for the correlators. This ensures that the solution to the dual program (47) picked by our solver among many equivalent expressions does not contain terms that blow up under small signaling fluctuations. See also [30] for a finer analysis of noise tolerance in equivalent Bell expressions.



Figure 2: Bounds on min-entropy rate $H_{\min}/n = -\log_2 G(\mathcal{V})$ (eq. (33) without the penalizing term) for a varying number of measurement runs n and for different Bell expressions. The protocol is simulated for the device behavior p in eq. (34) as explained in Section 7.2. The dashed line represents the min-entropy $-\log_2 G(p)$ associated to the behavior. The dash-dotted and dotted lines represent the min-entropies $-\log_2 G(I[p])$ given the expectation value of the CHSH expression I_{chsh} and the tilted-CHSH expression I_1^β, respectively.

The corresponding min-entropy rate bound (that is, (33) divided by n) for $\epsilon = 10^{-6}$ is represented in Figures 2 and 3 as a function of the number of runs n, respectively without and with the penalty term (setting $\tau = |\mathcal{A}| = 4$), for the three different Bell expressions: I_{chsh}, I_1^β and I_p. In these plots and the ones that follow, the curves are obtained by solving the program (29) at level 2 of the NPA hierarchy. All optimizations were performed using the MATLAB toolboxes YALMIP [31] and SeDuMi [32].

As we see in Figures 2 and 3, the use of the I_1^β and I_p Bell expressions for bounding the randomness of the input pair $(1, 0)$, which is made possible thanks to the generalization of the protocols [3, 14, 15] to cover the case $\mathcal{X}_r \subset \mathcal{X}$, results in a clear improvement over the CHSH expression for large n. However, for small n, the CHSH expression is still more efficient for certifying randomness. There are two factors contributing to this advantage for small n. Firstly, Figure 2 suggests that the CHSH expression has a better resistance to statistical fluctuations than the I_1^β and I_p expressions. Secondly, the penalty term is always equal to zero for the CHSH expression, while for the two other Bell expressions it only becomes negligible asymptotically, as illustrated in Figure 3. This is because for the CHSH expression, as noted earlier, one can take $\mathcal{X}_r = \mathcal{X}$ without affecting the RB function G; $\gamma(\vec{x})$ is then equal to zero.

Note that we did not attempt to optimize the choice of input distribution and it is possible that a different choice of $\pi(x)$ would lead to better bounds in Figure 3 for the I_1^β and I_p Bell expressions. However, one should exert care when making this choice, since, as we discussed in Section 7.1, it also influences the accuracy of the Bell expression estimation, and therefore the value of the randomness bounding function $G([\hat{\mathbf{f}}^-, \hat{\mathbf{f}}^+])$.

Finally, note that if no information is a priori available about the underlying behavior, and thus if we do not know which input will generate the most randomness, in the asymptotic limit it is strategically better to pick a single input $x = x^*$ at random and define $\mathcal{X}_r = \{x^*\}$. Indeed the RB function associated to x^* can only be better than (or equal to) a RB function valid for all inputs, which in a generic case will likely provide very poor bounds. However, there is still the risk of picking the worst input anyway and having a penalty error term in addition. For small values of n, using $\mathcal{X}_r = \mathcal{X}$ may thus be advantageous in order to cancel the penalty term, even if the RB function is not as good; this is for example the case when using the CHSH expression, as illustrated in Figure 3.



Figure 3: (Top) Penalty term in the min-entropy rate bound for different number of measurement rounds n. (Bottom) Bounds on min-entropy rate $H_{\min}/n = -\log_2 G(\mathcal{V}) - (\gamma(\vec{x})/n)\log_2\tau$ (eq. (33)) for a varying number of measurement runs n and for different Bell expressions. The bound for the CHSH expression is the same as in Figure 2 as it is not subject to a penalty term. The protocol is simulated for the device behavior p in eq. (34) as explained in Section 7.2. The dashed line represents the min-entropy $-\log_2 G(p)$ associated to the behavior. The dash-dotted and dotted lines represent the min-entropies $-\log_2 G(I[p])$ given the expectation value of the CHSH expression I_{chsh} and the tilted-CHSH expression I_1^β, respectively.

7.3 Bounding randomness from several Bell expressions ($t \geq 1$)

We now turn to the second element introduced in this work: the possibility to estimate the randomness from $t > 1$ Bell expressions, and in particular from the full set of observed frequencies of occurrence $\hat{p}$ as defined in eq. (17). The motivation for this modification is the possibility to certify randomness in an optimal way from the full set of data generated by the devices.

Let us start by reviewing in more detail the considerations that lead us to introduce such a modification. As noted above and in [19, 20], the dual version of problem (28) (see eq. (47) in the Appendix) implies that to each device behavior p is associated a single Bell expression I_p that optimally characterizes its randomness. This naively suggests the following scheme: (i) run the devices for n rounds, obtaining the output and input strings $\vec{a}$, $\vec{x}$; (ii) use the observed frequencies of occurrence $\hat{p}(a|x)$ as an estimate for the probabilities $p(a|x)$; (iii) determine the optimal Bell expression $I_{\hat{p}}$ associated to $\hat{p}$ using the results of [19, 20]; (iv) apply the analysis of [3, 14, 15] (i.e., that of our $t = 1$ protocol), with the particular Bell expression $I_{\hat{p}}$, to evaluate a min-entropy bound. This scheme, however, fails on several accounts.

First of all, the experimental frequencies $\hat{p}$ may not correspond to valid quantum probabilities (i.e., $\hat{p} \notin \mathcal{Q}$). They will for instance fail to satisfy exactly the normalization and no-signaling conditions, which are implicitly assumed in problem (28) (indeed the last constraint line requires that each p_λ belongs to $\mathcal{Q}$); the problem then becomes infeasible. One might think that this problem can be easily circumvented by introducing an intermediary procedure in which, given the frequencies $\hat{p}(a|x)$, one determines a valid quantum behavior $p'[\hat{p}]$ which is in some sense "close" to $\hat{p}$ (this has been for instance proposed in

[20, 33, 34]). One would then indeed be able to solve problem (28) (or its dual (47)) and obtain a valid Bell expression $I_{p'}$ which could in principle be used in our $t = 1$ protocol.

There is however a second more fundamental problem, which is that the Bell expression $I_{p'}$ returned by problem (47) is dependent on p' and thus on the observed frequencies $\hat{p}$. However, if the Bell expression used to estimate the device behavior is not fixed in advance, but can itself depend on the device behavior, then the application of the Azuma-Hoeffding inequality used to prove Lemmas 4 and 5 is not valid anymore. This is just a manifestation of the well known standard in statistical testing according to which the way the statistical analysis is performed should be decided independently of the data. Thus, even though our $t = 1$ protocol (like the protocols of [3, 14, 15]) can indeed be used with an arbitrary Bell expression, this Bell expression should be chosen *before* the start of the protocol and not *a posteriori*, based on the observed frequencies.

It is of course perfectly admissible to perform tests on the device *before* running the actual randomness generation protocol, in order to estimate p and use this information to find an appropriate Bell expression $I_{p'}$ as described above, which can afterwards be used in the randomness generation protocol proper. But this is a different procedure than an "on-line" estimation of the optimal randomness directly from the entire data generated by the devices in the course of the protocol, as we aim to achieve here. In particular, if one samples the devices ahead of time to come up with some Bell expression $I_{p'}$, the corresponding data must be thrown away and does not contribute to the final string of random bits. In addition, the behavior of the devices may have actually changed once the protocol starts, or could change during the execution of the protocol (due to drifts in the experimental set-up for example); in that case the expression $I_{p'}$ determined ahead of time may not be optimal anymore. Finally, the Bell expression I_p is only optimal with respect to a given set of *probabilities*, which only characterize its asymptotic behavior (provided that the device behaves in an i.i.d. way, which is not even guaranteed). Even if the device actually behaves according to a specified p, there is thus no guarantee that the corresponding "optimal" Bell expression I_p is actually optimal for a finite number n of runs.

These considerations lead us to introduce the possibility to bound the randomness from the estimation of several Bell expressions, and in particular directly from the entire set of frequencies $\hat{p} = \{\hat{p}(a|x)\}$ without having to choose a particular Bell expression f ahead of time. Of course, we must nevertheless fix in advance the rules according to which the statistical analysis must be done. This is why we must rely on a *fixed* choice of $t \geq 1$ Bell expressions.

When we have more than one Bell expression, the bound (33) generalizes to

$$H_{\min} \gtrsim -n \log_2 G\Big([\hat{\mathbf{f}}^-, \hat{\mathbf{f}}^+]\Big) - \gamma(\vec{x}) \log_2 \tau \tag{40}$$

where the one-dimensional interval $[f^-, \infty]$ has simply been replaced with the multidimensional region $[\hat{\mathbf{f}}^-, \hat{\mathbf{f}}^+]$. As before the limits of the region depend on the security parameter ϵ, the constants ν_α, and they become smaller with the number of runs n (see equations (24) and (25)).

In the remainder of this section, we consider the problem of choosing a good set of Bell expressions for the protocol. As a first step, we argue that increasing the number of Bell expressions can have both beneficial and detrimental consequences. We can reach an understanding of this by considering the optimization problem (29) that defines $G([\hat{\mathbf{f}}^-, \hat{\mathbf{f}}^+])$. This problem essentially evaluates the randomness of a certain quantum behavior p (itself seen as a decomposition $p = \sum_\lambda q_\lambda p_\lambda$) such that $\hat{\mathbf{f}}^- \leq \mathbf{f}[p] \leq \hat{\mathbf{f}}^+$. Each vector component of this constraint defines two affine constraints, $\hat{f}_\alpha^- \leq f_\alpha[p] \leq \hat{f}_\alpha^+$, restricting the set of values p can take in the optimization. From a geometrical point of view, for each $\alpha = 1, \ldots, t$, this defines two parallel hyperplanes in the space of behaviors, delimiting a region between them which we call a slab. The full constraint $\hat{\mathbf{f}}^- \leq \mathbf{f}[p] \leq \hat{\mathbf{f}}^+$ defines a polytope in the space of behaviors which is the intersection of all those slabs.

The optimization (29) identifies the worst-case bound on randomness for quantum behaviors inside this constraint polytope. We would therefore like to restrict this region as much as possible given a value of the confidence parameter ϵ. We thus see that adding Bell expressions is generally beneficial, as it cuts the constraint polytope into a smaller volume.

Making the slabs thinner is another way to restrict the constraint polytope. As we can see in eq. (24), this is controlled by the parameters $\epsilon_\alpha^\pm$: larger values give a thinner f_α slab. However, as stated in Lemma 5, the confidence parameter ϵ in the protocol is shared between all t Bell constraints, as $\sum_{\alpha=1}^t (\epsilon_\alpha^+ + \epsilon_\alpha^-) = \epsilon$, which means that we cannot make the slabs as thin as we want. A consequence of this is that the more Bell expressions we have, the smaller $\epsilon_\alpha^\pm$ are on average. If we are distributing ϵ



Figure 4: Bounds on the min-entropy rate $H_{\min}/n = -\log_2 G(\mathcal{V})$ (eq. (40) without the penalizing term) for a single Bell expression (I_{chsh} or I_p), and for a "complete" set of 8 expressions (4 local correlators and 4 CHSH permutations). The protocol is simulated for the device behavior p in eq. (34) as explained in Section 7.2. The dashed line represents the min-entropy $-\log_2 G(p)$ associated to the behavior. The dotted line represents the min-entropy $-\log_2 G(I_{\text{chsh}}[p])$ given the expectation value of the CHSH expression.

evenly across all $\epsilon_\alpha^\pm$ for instance, this amounts to a dilation of the constraint polytope in optimization (29). Nevertheless, since the width of the slab depends on ϵ only through a factor $\sqrt{\log(1/\epsilon_\alpha^\pm)}$, we will typically find that this negative effect is outweighed by the positives of adding more Bell expressions, and the randomness bound is globally improved.

This improvement is illustrated in Figure 4, where we reconsider the numerical example presented in Section 7.2. We now use 8 Bell expressions that are equivalent (for quantum behaviors) to the specification of the 16 probabilities $p(\mathrm{a_1a_2|x_1x_2})$ (we will explain why we use this choice of 8 Bell expressions later). We see that the randomness that we can certify is better than what can be extracted with the optimal Bell expression I_p alone, but also better than what can be extracted using the CHSH expression for small number of runs, where I_p does not perform well due to a worse tolerance to noise. Note that if we take into account the penalty factor linked to the choice of $\mathcal{X}_r$, the CHSH expression (which has no penalty term) regains its advantage for small n (see Figure 5).

Let us now discuss in more detail how we should choose the set of Bell expressions. For this, let us start by considering our protocol when $n \to \infty$. In this asymptotic limit, the interval $[\hat{\mathbf{f}}^-, \hat{\mathbf{f}}^+]$ narrows down towards the point $\hat{\mathbf{f}} = \mathbf{f}[\hat{p}(a|x)]$, which is just the value of the t Bell expressions $\mathbf{f}$ computed on the experimentally observed frequencies $\hat{p}(a|x)$. If the bias towards inputs in $\mathcal{X}_r$ is appropriately chosen (as discussed previously), then the relative contribution of the penalty term vanishes as $n \to \infty$ and the bound (40) becomes in the asymptotic limit, up to sublinear terms,

$$H_{\min} \gtrsim -n \log_2 G(\hat{\mathbf{f}}), \tag{41}$$

Furthermore, in the case where the device behaves in an i.i.d. way according to a behavior p, then, asymptotically, $\hat{\mathbf{f}} \to \mathbf{f}[p]$. If one chooses enough Bell expressions as to fully characterize the (n-round average) behavior of the devices (for instance, by using an estimator for each probability $p(a|x)$), $\hat{\mathbf{f}}$ thus becomes equivalent to the knowledge of p and the above bound converges to the maximal min-entropy bound one can obtain from p as characterized in [19, 20]. In this sense, and as seen in Figures 4 and 5, our protocol is asymptotically optimal, even if one has no prior information on the behavior p characterizing the devices.

Note that there are different sets of Bell estimators that are asymptotically equivalent to the knowledge of the full set of probabilities $p(a|x)$. For instance in a bipartite Bell experiment with two inputs

and two outputs there are 16 probabilities $p(a|x) = p(\mathrm{a_1 a_2}|\mathrm{x_1 x_2})$ with $\mathrm{a_1, a_2, x_1, x_2} \in \{0, 1\}$ and thus 16 associated Bell expressions $e_1, \ldots, e_{16}$ defined by $e_\alpha[p] = p(\mathrm{a_1 a_2}|\mathrm{x_1 x_2})$, with one value of α for each of the possible values of $(\mathrm{a_1, a_2, x_1, x_2})$. But since the probabilities $p(a|x)$ satisfy normalization and no-signaling, they are uniquely specified by the 8 correlators of eq. (36), which constitute 8 Bell expressions $g_1, \ldots, g_8$, where g_1 and g_2 are the first party's two marginal correlators $\langle A_{\mathrm{x_1}} \rangle$, g_3 and g_4 are the second party's $\langle B_{\mathrm{x_2}} \rangle$, and $g_4, \ldots, g_8$ are the four bipartite correlators $\langle A_{\mathrm{x_1}} B_{\mathrm{x_2}} \rangle$.

Alternatively, the probabilities are also equivalent to the 8 expressions $h_1, \ldots, h_8$ with $h_\alpha = g_\alpha$ for $\alpha = 1, \ldots, 4$, and h_α for $\alpha = 5, \ldots, 8$ are the four linearly independent versions of the CHSH expression, generalizing (37):

$$I_{\mathrm{chsh}}^{\mathrm{y_1,y_2}} = \sum_{\mathrm{x_1,x_2} \in \{0,1\}} (-1)^{(\mathrm{x_1}+\mathrm{y_1})(\mathrm{x_2}+\mathrm{y_2})} \langle A_{\mathrm{x_1}} B_{\mathrm{x_2}} \rangle \qquad \mathrm{y_1, y_2} \in \{0, 1\}. \tag{42}$$

As we increase the number of rounds, all these possible choices become equivalent, since the intervals $[\hat{\mathbf{e}}^-, \hat{\mathbf{e}}^+]$, $[\hat{\mathbf{g}}^-, \hat{\mathbf{g}}^+]$, $[\hat{\mathbf{h}}^-, \hat{\mathbf{h}}^+]$ define constraint polytopes in the space of behaviors p that asymptotically intersect the quantum set at the same unique point. However, the choice of one set of estimators over another could make a difference for finite n.

Generally speaking, when choosing which Bell expressions to use for a fixed number t, we may prefer that as many of them as possible be linearly independent. Consider $t - 1$ Bell expressions and their associated slabs, which define a constraint polytope. In the absence of any meaningful information concerning the behavior of the objective function of (29) within its feasible set, the choice of a t-th Bell expression should be dictated by the resulting reduction of the constraint polytope: cutting a large volume out is more likely to reduce the maximum of (29). As n grows large and the slabs grow thinner, the best way to reduce this volume is to choose a Bell expression that is linearly independent from the $t - 1$ previous ones, if possible. We can easily understand this in the asymptotic limit: as we mentioned above, the optimization converges to $G(\hat{\mathbf{f}})$, and with enough linearly independent Bell expressions, $\mathbf{f}[\hat{p}]$ uniquely defines $\hat{p}$, hence $G(\hat{\mathbf{f}}) = G(\hat{p})$. At this point, adding more expressions only makes $\mathbf{f}[\hat{p}]$ a more redundant definition of $\hat{p}$, which does not improve the randomness bound. On the other hand, with too few independent Bell expressions, $\hat{\mathbf{f}} = \mathbf{f}[\hat{p}]$ is compatible with many values of $\hat{p}$, and the worst value in terms of guessing probability is what ends up determining $G(\hat{\mathbf{f}})$.

In addition, we see that there is no need for Bell expressions that are purely signaling, i.e., that have a constant value for all no-signaling behaviors p. Indeed, since the feasible region of (29) is defined by the intersection of the slabs and the quantum set, constraints deriving from purely signaling expressions are trivial in this region, and therefore do not contribute to improve the randomness bound.

Combining these two conclusions also indicates that we should avoid Bell expressions that are only linearly dependent up to purely signaling terms. This implies for instance that the sets $g_1, \ldots, g_8$ or $h_1, \ldots, h_8$ should be preferred over $e_1, \ldots, e_{16}$. This is indeed what we find, as illustrated in Figure 6.

Note that the sets $g_1, \ldots, g_8$ and $h_1, \ldots, h_8$ only differ by a linear transformation, but the second set yields better results for the same (finite) number of rounds n. With respect to optimization (29), this means that the feasible set for $h_1, \ldots, h_8$ excluded the optimum obtained for $g_1, \ldots, g_8$. This might be related to the fact that in this scenario of two parties with two inputs and two outputs, the four versions of the CHSH inequalities constitute the facets that separate local from nonlocal behaviors, and they might therefore serve as better measures of nonlocality and randomness than the correlators $\langle A_{\mathrm{x_1}} B_{\mathrm{x_2}} \rangle$.

This phenomenon can be visualized in a simpler instance where two Bell expressions are used, namely, $I_{\mathrm{chsh}}^{0,0}$ and $I_{\mathrm{chsh}}^{0,1}$. In Figure 7, we represent the guessing probability $G(I_{\mathrm{chsh}}^{0,0}[p], I_{\mathrm{chsh}}^{0,1}[p])$, as defined in eq. (28). The figure shows the evolution of the guessing probability, from a trivial value of 1 for values of $I_{\mathrm{chsh}}^{0,0}[p]$ and $I_{\mathrm{chsh}}^{0,1}[p]$ compatible with a local hidden variable model, to nontrivial values up to approximately 0.32 reached at extremal points. The variation in guessing probability along these two axes is not trivial, but as we can see, the gradient mostly points along the directions of the CHSH axes, with the exception of the regions where the local and quantum boundaries meet. To minimize the variation of the guessing probability within a confidence interval of fixed square shape in this plane, it is best to rotate it so that its sides are aligned with the gradient. Aligning this square with the two CHSH axes is therefore a sensible choice in this case.



Figure 5: Bounds on the min-entropy rate $H_{\min}/n = -\log_2 G(\mathcal{V}) - (\gamma(\vec{x})/n)\log_2 \tau$ (eq. (40)), including the penalizing term, for a single Bell expression (I_{chsh} or I_p), and for a "complete" set of 8 expressions. The protocol is simulated for the device behavior p in eq. (34) as explained in Section 7.2. The dashed line represents the min-entropy $-\log_2 G(p)$ associated to the behavior. The dotted line represents the min-entropy $-\log_2 G(I_{\text{chsh}}[p])$ given the expectation value of the CHSH expression.



Figure 6: Bounds on the min-entropy rate $H_{\min}/n = -\log_2 G(\mathcal{V})$ (eq. (40) without the penalizing term) for three (asymptotically) equivalent sets of Bell expressions. The protocol is simulated for the device behavior p in eq. (34) as explained in Section 7.2. The dashed line represents the min-entropy $-\log_2 G(p)$ associated to the behavior.



Figure 7: Guessing probability $G(f_1, f_2)$ according to (28), with $f_1 = I^{0,0}_{\text{chsh}}$ and $f_2 = I^{0,1}_{\text{chsh}}$, as defined in (42). The set of local behaviors projected onto this plane defines a square region, represented with a dotted line. The quantum set $\mathcal{Q}$ projects into the circular region $(I^{0,0}_{\text{chsh}}[p])^2 + (I^{0,1}_{\text{chsh}}[p])^2 \leq 8$ [35]. Note that this guessing probability is centrally symmetric, but it is not symmetric under reflection through either CHSH axis. The guessing probability was computed by solving the optimization program (28) at level 2 of the NPA hierarchy.

8 Conclusion and open questions

In recent years several protocols for generating randomness in a DI way have been introduced [2–17], with varying degrees of security, rate of randomness expansion, or noise robustness. They all, however, share the feature that they rely on the estimation of a single Bell expression.

As was shown in [19, 20], in an idealized setting in which the behavior of the devices is known and fixed, more randomness can in principle be certified if one takes into account the violation of several Bell inequalities, or, even better, the full set of probabilities characterizing the devices' behavior.

We have shown here that this is also true in the context of an actual DIRNG protocol, where randomness is directly certified from experimental data without making any prior assumptions on the device behavior. Specifically, we have combined the analysis of [19, 20] with the protocol introduced in [3, 14, 15], which generates certified randomness against an adversary with classical side information. We have in this way obtained a family of DIRNG protocols which rely on the estimation of a choice of $t \geq 1$ Bell expressions. This includes the special case where the randomness is directly certified from the knowledge of the relative frequencies of occurrence of the outputs given the inputs. Asymptotically, this results in an optimal generation of randomness (as measured by the min-entropy) from experimental data without having to assume beforehand that the devices violate a specific Bell inequality.

Furthermore, our protocol also provides a way of treating the case where the randomness of the outcomes of the devices is much higher for some inputs than for others. This happens in particular when generating randomness from partially entangled states [21], which are used in present photonic loophole-free Bell experiments [28, 29]. Our analysis essentially amounts to consider that all the randomness has been generated from the optimal set of inputs, but corrected by a penalty term that is proportional to the number of events corresponding to non-optimal inputs. By biasing the choices of inputs towards the optimal ones, one can make this penalty term negligible asymptotically. However, for small number of measurement runs, we have seen that this procedure may be less efficient than an analysis based on a

Bell expression that treats all inputs on the same footing, like the CHSH expression. Thus, it seems that for small number of measurement runs, the CHSH expression is still the most apt Bell expression to certify the randomness in Bell experiments based on partially entangled states such as [26–29]. It would be interesting to understand whether this is always the case or whether it is an artifact of our analysis. Another related question comes from the fact that many equivalent forms exist for Bell expressions, presenting different sensitivity to fluctuations [30]. It would be good to understand how this variation of noise tolerance could help us choose a more suitable set of Bell expressions in our protocol.

Our result could be generalized in several ways. There are in particular three main directions for improvement. First of all, how to prove security against quantum side information when several Bell expressions or the full set of data generated in the experiment are taken into account? This is not a priori easy to answer since the analysis of most DIRNG protocols secure against quantum side information rely on Bell expressions with a particular structure [6, 8, 11] or, when they allow for arbitrary Bell expressions, do not optimally take into account the observed level of violation [17]. Second, we based the statistical analysis on the Azuma-Hoeffding inequality, but alternative deviation theorems [36] could be adapted to our setting. Third, our analysis only leads at best to an amount of private final randomness that is quadratic in the amount of public initial randomness necessary to run the protocol. In comparison, other protocols can achieve exponential or even unbounded ratios of final to initial randomness. Can this be improved?

Finally, we note that since DIRNG is not the only task where information from several Bell estimators can be exploited, a similar approach could be developed for other DI problems, such as DI quantum key distribution.

Acknowledgments

We acknowledge financial support from the Fondation Wiener-Anspach, the Interuniversity Attraction Poles program of the Belgian Science Policy Office under the grant IAP P7-35 photonics@be, and the Fonds de la Recherche Scientifique F.R.S.-FNRS (Belgium). O. N.S. acknowledges financial support through a grant of the Fonds pour la Formation à la Recherche dans l'Industrie et l'Agriculture (F.R.I.A.). C. B. acknowledges funding from the F.R.S.-FNRS through a Research Fellowship. J. S. was a post-doctoral researcher of the F.R.S.-FNRS at the time this research was carried out. S. P. is a Research Associate of the F.R.S.-FNRS. All plots were produced using TikZ [37] and PGFPLOTS [38]. The heat map of Figure 7 was produced using Matplotlib [39].

A Appendix

The problems introduced in Section 5 are typical instances of conic programming. A conic program is an optimization problem of the form

$$\begin{aligned} \underset{\{x_i\}}{\text{maximize}} \quad & \sum_{i=1}^{k} \langle c_i, x_i \rangle \\ \text{subject to} \quad & \sum_{i=1}^{k} A_i x_i = b \\ & x_i \in K_i \qquad i = 1, \ldots, k \end{aligned} \tag{43}$$

where $b \in \mathbb{R}^m$, $x_i, c_i \in \mathbb{R}^{n_i}$, $A_i \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n_i}$, and K_i are closed convex cones ($i = 1, \ldots, k$). Here $\langle c, x \rangle$ denotes the usual scalar product $\langle c, x \rangle = \sum_{j=1}^{n} c_j x_j$ between vectors in $\mathbb{R}^n$ and a set K is a convex cone if $q_1 p_1 + q_2 p_2$ belongs to K for any positive scalars $q_1, q_2 \geq 0$ and any p_1, p_2 in K.

In other words, an optimization problem is a conic program if it involves the maximization of a linear function of the optimization variables given linear constraints on such variables and the condition that they belong to a certain family of cones. Many familiar convex optimization problems, including linear and semidefinite programming, are instances of conic programming.

The problems (30) and (31), and their NPA relaxations, are also conic programs. Indeed, the set of unnormalized behaviors $\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}$ and all of its NPA relaxations are clearly cones and all other constraints in

(30) and (31) are linear in the variables $\tilde{p}_{a,x}$. As we said earlier, the NPA relaxations of these problems actually correspond to a specific type of conic programs, i.e., semidefinite programs.

Any conic program in the primal form (43) admits a dual formulation given by [40]

$$\begin{aligned} \underset{y}{\text{minimize}} \quad & \langle b, y\rangle \\ \text{subject to} \quad & A_i^T y - c_i \in K_i^* \qquad i = 1, \ldots, k \end{aligned} \tag{44}$$

where $y \in \mathbb{R}^m$ and $K_i^* = \{z_i \in \mathbb{R}^{n_i} : \langle z_i, x_i\rangle \geq 0, \, \forall x_i \in K_i\}$ is the dual cone of K_i. Let α denote the value of the primal program (43) and β the value of the dual program (44). Then the strong duality theorem of conic programming says that if the primal program is feasible, has finite value α, and has points $\tilde{x}_i \in \text{int}(K_i)$ such that $\sum_{i=1}^k A_i \tilde{x}_i = b$, then the dual program is feasible and has finite value $\beta = \alpha$ [40].

Let us determine the dual of the optimization problem (30). From now on, we take generically $\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}$ to denote the cone of unnormalized quantum behaviors or any of its NPA relaxations, as the analysis is identical in both cases.

Let us first rewrite (30) in a form similar to (43). For this, define $c_{ax} \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{A}|\times|\mathcal{X}|}$ as the vector with components $c_{ax}(a'|x') = \delta_{aa'}\delta_{xx'}$. Thus $\langle c_{ax}, p\rangle = p(a|x)$. Let $b \in \mathbb{R}^{1+t} = (1, f_1[p], \ldots, f_t[p])$. Let u be any Bell expression such that $u[p] = \text{Tr}[p]$ for all no-signaling behaviors p, for instance $u(a, x) = \delta_{x,x_0}$ for some input $x_0 \in \mathcal{X}$. Let A_{ax} be matrices in $\mathbb{R}^{1+t,|\mathcal{A}|\times|\mathcal{X}_r|}$ with components $[A_{ax}]_{1,a'x'} = u(a', x')$ and $[A_{ax}]_{1+\alpha,a'x'} = f_\alpha(a', x')$ for $\alpha = 1, \ldots, t$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} G(\mathbf{f}[p]) = \max_{\{\tilde{p}_{a,x}\}_{a\in\mathcal{A},x\in\mathcal{X}_r}} \quad & \sum_{a\in\mathcal{A},x\in\mathcal{X}_r} \langle c_{ax}, \tilde{p}_{ax}\rangle \\ \text{subject to} \quad & \sum_{a\in\mathcal{A},x\in\mathcal{X}_r} A_{ax}\tilde{p}_{ax} = b \\ & \tilde{p}_{a,x} \in \tilde{\mathcal{Q}} \quad \forall a \in \mathcal{A}, \forall x \in \mathcal{X}_r. \end{aligned} \tag{45}$$

The dual is then readily given as

$$\begin{aligned} G(\mathbf{f}[p]) = \min_{y\in\mathbb{R}^{1+t}} \quad & \langle b, y\rangle \\ \text{subject to} \quad & A_{ax}^T y - c_{ax} \in Q^* \qquad \forall a \in \mathcal{A}, \forall x \in \mathcal{X}_r \, , \end{aligned} \tag{46}$$

where $\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}^*$ is the dual cone of $\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}$, that is, the set $\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}^* = \{c \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{A}|\times|\mathcal{X}|} : \langle c, \tilde{p}\rangle \geq 0, \, \forall \tilde{p} \in \tilde{\mathcal{Q}}\}$. Note that this dual cone can be identified with the set of Tsirelson inequalities for normalized behaviors, that is, the set $\mathcal{Q}^* = \{(d_0, d) \in \mathbb{R}^{1+|\mathcal{A}|\times|\mathcal{X}|} : \langle d, p\rangle \leq d_0, \, \forall p \in \mathcal{Q}\}$. Indeed, note that by normalization $\langle u, p\rangle = 1$ and thus an inequality $\langle d, p\rangle \leq d_0$ valid for $p \in \mathcal{Q}$ can always be rewritten in the form $\langle (d_0 u - d), p\rangle \geq 0$, hence in the form $\langle c, p\rangle \geq 0$ for some suitable c. But an inequality $\langle c, p\rangle \geq 0$ is clearly valid for $\mathcal{Q}$ if and only if it is valid for $\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}$.

Using the explicit form of b, A_{ax}, and c_{ax} and the above interpretation of $\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}^*$, we can rewrite the dual (46) as

$$\begin{aligned} G(\mathbf{f}[p]) = \min_{y\in\mathbb{R}^{1+t}} \quad & y_0 + \sum_{\alpha=1}^{t} y_\alpha f_\alpha[p] \\ \text{subject to} \quad & p'(a|x) \leq y_0 + \sum_{\alpha=1}^{t} y_\alpha f_\alpha[p'] \quad \forall a \in \mathcal{A}, \, \forall x \in \mathcal{X}_r, \, \forall p' \in \mathcal{Q}. \end{aligned} \tag{47}$$

The interpretation of this dual problem is immediate. We are seeking a linear function $y_0 + \sum_a y_\alpha f_\alpha[p]$ satisfying the condition 1 in Definition 1—this is the constraint line of the optimization problem (47). Since the function is linear, it is also concave and the condition 2 in Definition 1 is also trivially satisfied. We are then searching for the best function of this form, i.e., the one that gives the lowest possible value (i.e., the most randomness) for the given Bell expectations $\mathbf{f}[p]$. Note that considering a linear function is actually not a restriction because the optimal function $G(\mathbf{f}[p])$ is concave, and therefore it is equivalent to the envelope of its tangents, which are linear in $\mathbf{f}[p]$.

From the point of view of implementations, the condition that $p'(a|x) \leq y_0 + \sum_\alpha y_\alpha f_\alpha[p']$ is valid for $\mathcal{Q}$ can be cast as a search for a sum-of-squares decomposition of this inequality. When $\mathcal{Q}$ is one of the NPA relaxations of the quantum set, this is equivalent to solving a certain SDP, which turns out to be, as expected, the dual of the original NPA problem.

Let us now determine the dual of the noisy problem (31), which we can rewrite as

$$\begin{aligned} G([\hat{\mathbf{f}}^-, \hat{\mathbf{f}}^+]) = \max_{\substack{\{\tilde{p}_{a,x}\}_{a\in\mathcal{A},x\in\mathcal{X}_r} \\ \boldsymbol{\eta},\boldsymbol{\kappa}\in\mathbb{R}^t}} & \sum_{a\in\mathcal{A},x\in\mathcal{X}_r} \tilde{p}_{a,x}(a|x) \\ \text{subject to} & \sum_{a\in\mathcal{A},x\in\mathcal{X}_r} \mathrm{Tr}[\tilde{p}_{a,x}] = 1 \\ & \sum_{a\in\mathcal{A},x\in\mathcal{X}_r} \mathbf{f}[\tilde{p}_{a,z}] + \boldsymbol{\eta} = \hat{\mathbf{f}}^+ \\ & \sum_{a\in\mathcal{A},x\in\mathcal{X}_r} \mathbf{f}[\tilde{p}_{a,z}] - \boldsymbol{\kappa} = \hat{\mathbf{f}}^- \\ & \tilde{p}_{a,x} \in \mathcal{Q} \quad \forall a \in \mathcal{A}, \forall x \in \mathcal{X}_r \\ & \boldsymbol{\eta}, \boldsymbol{\kappa} \in \mathbb{R}^t_+ \end{aligned} \tag{48}$$

Again, let us rewrite in a form similar to (43). For this, define $b \in \mathbb{R}^{1+2t} = (1, \hat{f}_1^+, \ldots, \hat{f}_t^+, \hat{f}_1^-, \ldots, \hat{f}_t^-)$. Let A_{ax} be matrices in $\mathbb{R}^{1+2t,|\mathcal{A}|\times|\mathcal{X}_r|}$ with components $[A_{ax}]_{1,a'x'} = u(a',x')$ and $[A_{ax}]_{1+\alpha,a'x'} = f_\alpha(a',x')$ as above, and $[A_{ax}]_{1+t+\alpha,a'x'} = f_\alpha(a',x')$, for $\alpha = 1,\ldots,t$. Additionally, we define two matrices A_1, A_2 in $\mathbb{R}^{1+2t,t}$ through $[A_1]_{1,\alpha} = 0$, $[A_1]_{1+\alpha,\alpha'} = \delta_{\alpha,\alpha'}$, $[A_1]_{1+t+\alpha,\alpha'} = 0$ and $[A_2]_{1,\alpha} = 0$, $[A_2]_{1+\alpha,\alpha'} = 0$, $[A_2]_{1+t+\alpha,\alpha'} = -\delta_{\alpha,\alpha'}$ for $\alpha, \alpha' \in \{1,\ldots,t\}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} G([\hat{\mathbf{f}}^-, \hat{\mathbf{f}}^+]) = \max_{\substack{\{\tilde{p}_{a,x}\}_{a\in\mathcal{A},x\in\mathcal{X}_r} \\ \boldsymbol{\eta},\boldsymbol{\kappa}\in\mathbb{R}^t}} & \sum_{a\in\mathcal{A},x\in\mathcal{X}_r} \langle c_{az}, p\rangle \\ \text{subject to} & \sum_{a\in\mathcal{A},x\in\mathcal{X}_r} A_{ax}p_{ax} + A_1\boldsymbol{\eta} + A_2\boldsymbol{\kappa} = b \\ & \tilde{p}_{a,x} \in \mathcal{Q} \quad \forall a \in \mathcal{A}, \forall x \in \mathcal{X}_r \\ & \boldsymbol{\eta}, \boldsymbol{\kappa} \in \mathbb{R}^t_+ \end{aligned} \tag{49}$$

The dual is then readily given as

$$\begin{aligned} G([\hat{\mathbf{f}}^-, \hat{\mathbf{f}}^+]) = \min_{v\in\mathbb{R}^{1+2t}} & \langle b, v\rangle \\ \text{subject to} & A_{ax}^T v - c_{ax} \in \tilde{\mathcal{Q}}^* \qquad \forall a \in \mathcal{A}, \forall x \in \mathcal{X}_r \\ & A_1^T v, A_2^T v \in \mathbb{R}^t_+ \end{aligned} \tag{50}$$

or, writing $v = (v_0, v_1, \ldots, v_t, v'_1, \ldots, v'_t)$

$$\begin{aligned} G([\hat{\mathbf{f}}^-, \hat{\mathbf{f}}^+]) = \min_{v\in\mathbb{R}^{1+2t}} & v_0 + \sum_{\alpha=1}^t v_\alpha \hat{f}_\alpha^+ + \sum_{\alpha=1}^t v'_\alpha \hat{f}_\alpha^- \\ \text{subject to} & v_0 + \sum_{\alpha=1}^t (v_\alpha + v'_\alpha) f_\alpha - c_{ax} \in \tilde{\mathcal{Q}}^* \quad \forall a \in \mathcal{A}, \forall x \in \mathcal{X}_r \\ & v_\alpha \geq 0, v'_\alpha \leq 0 \quad \forall \alpha = 1,\ldots,t \end{aligned} \tag{51}$$

Defining $(y_0, y_\alpha^+, y_\alpha^-) = (v_0, v_\alpha, -v'_\alpha)$ and $y_\alpha = v_\alpha + v'_\alpha = y_\alpha^+ - y_\alpha^-$, we can reformulate this as

$$\begin{aligned} G([\hat{\mathbf{f}}^-, \hat{\mathbf{f}}^+]) = \min_{(y_0,y^+,y^-)\in\mathbb{R}^{1+2t}} & y_0 + \sum_{\alpha=1}^t y_\alpha^+ \hat{f}_\alpha^+ - \sum_{\alpha=1}^t y_\alpha^- \hat{f}_\alpha^- \\ \text{subject to} & p'(a|x) \leq y_0 + \sum_{\alpha=1}^t y_\alpha f_\alpha[p'] \quad \forall a \in \mathcal{A}, \forall x \in \mathcal{X}_r, \forall p' \in \mathcal{Q} \\ & y_\alpha = y_\alpha^+ - y_\alpha^-, \quad y_\alpha^+, y_\alpha^- \geq 0 \quad \forall \alpha = 1,\ldots,t \end{aligned} \tag{52}$$

This dual formulation is analogous to (46) and can be understood in the same way. The difference lies in the objective function.

Although (52) is the best way to express the optimization for a numerical implementation, we may further simplify its expression by noting that, for a fixed value of y_0 and $\{y_\alpha\}$, the objective function is minimized when $y_\alpha^+ = y_\alpha$ if $y_\alpha \geq 0$ and $y_\alpha^- = -y_\alpha$ if $y_\alpha \leq 0$ (in short, $y_\alpha^\pm = (y_\alpha \pm |y_\alpha|)/2$). For those values of $y_\alpha^\pm$, we can suppress terms in the objective function, which then becomes

$$y_0 + \sum_{\alpha : y_\alpha \geq 0} y_\alpha \hat{f}_\alpha^+ + \sum_{\alpha : y_\alpha < 0} y_\alpha \hat{f}_\alpha^- \,, \tag{53}$$

and which we can express as the maximum

$$\max_{\mathbf{f} \in [\hat{\mathbf{f}}^-, \hat{\mathbf{f}}^+]} y_0 + \sum_\alpha y_\alpha f_\alpha \,. \tag{54}$$

Indeed, the maximum will clearly be attained at one of the extreme points of the region $[\hat{\mathbf{f}}^-, \hat{\mathbf{f}}^+]$, whose components are of the form $f_\alpha^\pm$. If $y_\alpha \geq 0$, the maximum will be attained when f_α is equal to $\hat{f}_\alpha^+$, if $y_\alpha \leq 0$, when it is equal to $\hat{f}_\alpha^-$. All in all, (52) can thus be rewritten as the nested optimization

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{(y_0, y) \in \mathbb{R}^{1+t}} \quad & \max_{\mathbf{f} \in [\hat{\mathbf{f}}^-, \hat{\mathbf{f}}^+]} \quad y_0 + \sum_{\alpha=1}^{t} y_\alpha f_\alpha \\ & \text{subject to} \quad p'(a|x) \leq y_0 + \sum_{\alpha=1}^{t} y_\alpha f_\alpha[p'] \quad \forall a \in \mathcal{A}, \forall x \in \mathcal{X}_r, \forall p' \in \mathcal{Q} \,. \end{aligned} \tag{55}$$

In (52), we are thus solving a problem completely analogous to (47) except that the objective function now yields a bound on $G(\mathbf{f})$ that holds on the entire region $[\hat{\mathbf{f}}^-, \hat{\mathbf{f}}^+]$. Since we minimize the objective function, we are searching for the best possible such bound.

Now, since the extreme points of $[\hat{\mathbf{f}}^-, \hat{\mathbf{f}}^+]$ are not necessarily quantum (i.e., do not necessarily belong to $\mathbf{f}(\mathcal{Q})$), one could expect this upper bound to be strictly higher than the optimal quantum bound in $[\hat{\mathbf{f}}^-, \hat{\mathbf{f}}^+]$, contrarily to the primal formulation (29). But this is not the case, as follows from the duality property of conic programs. As we mentioned, the strong duality theorem for conic programs [40] ensures that the value of the dual (55) matches that of the primal (31), as long as the primal has a strictly feasible point. That is, there exists a set of subnormalized probability vectors $\{\tilde{p}_{a,x}\}$ such that all the equality constraints of the optimization are satisfied, and which lie in the interior of their respective cones, i.e., $\tilde{p}_{a,x} \in \text{int}(\tilde{\mathcal{Q}})$ for all $a \in \mathcal{A}, x \in \mathcal{X}_r$. We argue that when the primal is not infeasible, this is almost always the case.

Consider the set $\mathbf{f}[\text{int}(\mathcal{Q})]$, that is, the set of Bell value vectors that are compatible with a non-extremal quantum behavior. If the intersection of this set with the confidence region $[\hat{\mathbf{f}}^-, \hat{\mathbf{f}}^+]$ is non-null, we have strict feasibility of (31). Indeed, let $p \in \text{int}(\mathcal{Q})$ a behavior such that $\mathbf{f}[p] \in [\hat{\mathbf{f}}^-, \hat{\mathbf{f}}^+]$. Then, any decomposition of p as a sum of points in $\text{int}(\tilde{\mathcal{Q}})$, for instance $\tilde{p}_{a,x} = p/(|\mathcal{A}| \times |\mathcal{X}_r|)$, gives a strictly feasible point for (31).

On the other hand, if the closure $\overline{\mathbf{f}[\mathcal{Q}]}$ has no intersection with $[\hat{\mathbf{f}}^-, \hat{\mathbf{f}}^+]$, then the primal (31) is infeasible and the dual (55) diverges to $-\infty$, as a rather straightforward application of the hyperplane separation theorem shows.

The last possibility is that $\mathbf{f}[\text{int}(\mathcal{Q})]$ has a point of tangency with $[\hat{\mathbf{f}}^-, \hat{\mathbf{f}}^+]$ or, in terms of separating hyperplanes, where there exist $\{y_0, y_\alpha\}$ such that $\sum_\alpha y_\alpha f_\alpha > y_0$ for all $\mathbf{f} \in \mathbf{f}[\text{int}(\mathcal{Q})]$, and $\sum_\alpha y_\alpha f_\alpha \leq y_0$ for all $\mathbf{f} \in [\hat{\mathbf{f}}^-, \hat{\mathbf{f}}^+]$. In this case, there might only exist non-strictly feasible points for the primal, while the dual does not diverge. Without strong duality, there is no guarantee that the two resulting values are the same. However, this case is irrelevant to us, as the chances that the confidence interval $[\hat{\mathbf{f}}^-, \hat{\mathbf{f}}^+]$ around our estimated frequencies is tangent to $\mathbf{f}[\text{int}(\mathcal{Q})]$ are essentially zero.

Thus, in practice, the primal is either infeasible or it is strictly feasible. Hence, when the dual (55) converges, we can safely conclude strong duality, and the optimum of the dual is indeed not worsened by allowing the dual to select $\mathbf{f} \notin \mathbf{f}[\mathcal{Q}]$, since the same value as computed by the primal (31) is achieved by a feasible point $\{\tilde{p}_{a,x}\}$ such that $G([\hat{\mathbf{f}}^-, \hat{\mathbf{f}}^+]) = G(f[p])$ with $p = \sum_{a,x} p_{a,x} \in \mathcal{Q}$.

References

[1] J. F. Clauser, M. A. Horne, A. Shimony, and R. A. Holt, "Proposed experiment to test local hidden-variable theories," Physical Review Letters **23**, 880–884 (1969).

[2] R. Colbeck, *Quantum and relativistic protocols for secure multi-party computation*, Ph.D. thesis, University of Cambridge (2009), arXiv:0911.3814 [quant-ph] ; R. Colbeck and A. Kent, "Private randomness expansion with untrusted devices," Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical **44**, 095305 (2011).

[3] S. Pironio, A. Acin, S. Massar, A. Boyer de la Giroday, D. N. Matsukevich, P. Maunz, S. Olmschenk, D. Hayes, L. Luo, T. A. Manning, and C. Monroe, "Random numbers certified by Bell's theorem," Nature **464**, 1021 (2010).

[4] D. Mayers and A. Yao, "Quantum cryptography with imperfect apparatus," in *Proceedings of the 39th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science*, FOCS '98 (IEEE Computer Society, Washington, DC, USA, 1998) p. 503.

[5] A. Acín, N. Brunner, N. Gisin, S. Massar, S. Pironio, and V. Scarani, "Device-independent security of quantum cryptography against collective attacks," Physical Review Letters **98**, 230501 (2007).

[6] U. Vazirani and T. Vidick, "Certifiable quantum dice," Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society A: Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences **370**, 3432–3448 (2012).

[7] B. W. Reichardt, F. Unger, and U. Vazirani, "Classical command of quantum systems," Nature **496**, 456–460 (2013).

[8] M. Coudron and H. Yuen, "Infinite randomness expansion and amplification with a constant number of devices," (2013), arXiv:1310.6755 [quant-ph] .

[9] R. Arnon-Friedman, R. Renner, and T. Vidick, "Simple and tight device-independent security proofs," (2016), arXiv:1607.01797 [quant-ph] .

[10] Ll. Masanes, "Universally composable privacy amplification from causality constraints," Physical Review Letters **102**, 140501 (2009).

[11] C. A. Miller and Y. Shi, "Robust protocols for securely expanding randomness and distributing keys using untrusted quantum devices," (2014), arXiv:1402.0489 [quant-ph] .

[12] Ll. Masanes, R. Renner, M. Christandl, A. Winter, and J. Barrett, "Full security of quantum key distribution from no-signaling constraints," IEEE Transactions on Information Theory **60**, 4973–4986 (2014).

[13] Ll. Masanes, S. Pironio, and A. Acín, "Secure device-independent quantum key distribution with causally independent measurement devices," Nature Communications **2**, 238 (2011).

[14] S. Pironio and S. Massar, "Security of practical private randomness generation," Physical Review A **87**, 012336 (2013).

[15] S. Fehr, R. Gelles, and C. Schaffner, "Security and composability of randomness expansion from Bell inequalities," Physical Review A **87**, 012335 (2013).

[16] S. Pironio, Ll. Masanes, A. Leverrier, and A. Acín, "Security of device-independent quantum key distribution in the bounded-quantum-storage model," Physical Review X **3**, 031007 (2013).

[17] C. A. Miller and Y. Shi, "Universal security for randomness expansion from the spot-checking protocol," (2014), arXiv:1411.6608 [quant-ph] .

[18] R. Ramanathan, F. G. Brandão, K. Horodecki, M. Horodecki, P. Horodecki, and H. Wojewódka, "Randomness amplification under minimal fundamental assumptions on the devices," Physical Review Letters **117**, 230501 (2016).

[19] O. Nieto-Silleras, S. Pironio, and J. Silman, "Using complete measurement statistics for optimal device-independent randomness evaluation," New Journal of Physics **16**, 013035 (2014).

[20] J.-D. Bancal, L. Sheridan, and V. Scarani, "More randomness from the same data," New Journal of Physics **16**, 033011 (2014).

[21] A. Acín, S. Massar, and S. Pironio, "Randomness versus nonlocality and entanglement," Physical Review Letters **108**, 100402 (2012).

[22] M. Navascués, S. Pironio, and A. Acín, "A convergent hierarchy of semidefinite programs characterizing the set of quantum correlations," New Journal of Physics **10**, 073013 (2008).

[23] R. Konig, R. Renner, and C. Schaffner, "The operational meaning of min- and max-entropy," IEEE Transactions on Information Theory **55**, 4337–4347 (2009).

[24] A. De, C. Portmann, T. Vidick, and R. Renner, "Trevisan's extractor in the presence of quantum side information," SIAM Journal on Computing **41**, 915–940 (2012).

[25] K.-M. Chung, Y. Shi, and X. Wu, "Physical randomness extractors: generating random numbers with minimal assumptions," (2014), arXiv:1402.4797 [quant-ph] .

[26] B. G. Christensen, K. T. McCusker, J. B. Altepeter, B. Calkins, T. Gerrits, A. E. Lita, A. Miller, L. K. Shalm, Y. Zhang, S. W. Nam, N. Brunner, C. C. W. Lim, N. Gisin, and P. G. Kwiat, "Detection-loophole-free test of quantum nonlocality, and applications," Physical Review Letters **111**, 130406 (2013).

[27] M. Giustina, A. Mech, S. Ramelow, B. Wittmann, J. Kofler, J. Beyer, A. Lita, B. Calkins, T. Gerrits, S. W. Nam, R. Ursin, and A. Zeilinger, "Bell violation using entangled photons without the fair-sampling assumption," Nature **497**, 227–230 (2013).

[28] M. Giustina, M. A. Versteegh, S. Wengerowsky, J. Handsteiner, A. Hochrainer, K. Phelan, F. Steinlechner, J. Kofler, J.-Å. Larsson, C. Abellán, W. Amaya, V. Pruneri, M. W. Mitchell, J. Beyer, T. Gerrits, A. E. Lita, L. K. Shalm, S. W. Nam, T. Scheidl, R. Ursin, B. Wittmann, and A. Zeilinger, "Significant-loophole-free test of Bell's theorem with entangled photons," Physical Review Letters **115**, 250401 (2015).

[29] L. K. Shalm, E. Meyer-Scott, B. G. Christensen, P. Bierhorst, M. A. Wayne, M. J. Stevens, T. Gerrits, S. Glancy, D. R. Hamel, M. S. Allman, K. J. Coakley, S. D. Dyer, C. Hodge, A. E. Lita, V. B. Verma, C. Lambrocco, E. Tortorici, A. L. Migdall, Y. Zhang, D. R. Kumor, W. H. Farr, F. Marsili, M. D. Shaw, J. A. Stern, C. Abellán, W. Amaya, V. Pruneri, T. Jennewein, M. W. Mitchell, P. G. Kwiat, J. C. Bienfang, R. P. Mirin, E. Knill, and S. W. Nam, "Strong loophole-free test of local realism," Physical Review Letters **115**, 250402 (2015).

[30] M.-O. Renou, D. Rosset, A. Martin, and N. Gisin, "On the inequivalence of the CH and CHSH inequalities due to finite statistics," (2016), arXiv:1610.01833 [quant-ph] .

[31] J. Löfberg, "YALMIP : A Toolbox for Modeling and Optimization in MATLAB," in *In Proceedings of the CACSD Conference* (Taipei, Taiwan, 2004).

[32] J. Sturm, "Using SeDuMi 1.02, a MATLAB toolbox for optimization over symmetric cones," Optim. Methods Software **11–12**, 625–653 (1999), version 1.3 available from `http://sedumi.ie.lehigh.edu/`.

[33] A. Máttar, D. Cavalcanti, P. Skrzypczyk, G. H. Aguilar, R. V. Nery, P. H. S. Ribeiro, and S. P. Walborn, "Experimental multipartite entanglement and randomness certification of the W state in the quantum steering scenario," (2016), arXiv:1609.00226 [quant-ph] .

[34] S. Schwarz, B. Bessire, A. Stefanov, and Y.-C. Liang, "Bipartite Bell inequalities with three ternary-outcome measurements—from theory to experiments," New Journal of Physics **18**, 035001 (2016).

[35] Ll. Masanes, "Necessary and sufficient condition for quantum-generated correlations," (2003), arXiv:quant-ph/0309137 .

[36] D. Elkouss and S. Wehner, "(Nearly) optimal P-values for all Bell inequalities," (2015), arXiv:1510.07233 [quant-ph] .

[37] T. Tantau, *The TikZ and* PGF *Packages* (2015).

[38] C. Feuersänger, *Manual for Package* PGFPLOTS (2016).

[39] J. D. Hunter, "Matplotlib: A 2d graphics environment," Computing In Science & Engineering **9**, 90–95 (2007).

[40] S. P. Boyd and L. Vandenberghe, *Convex Optimization* (Cambridge University Press, 2004).